

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XVII.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

No. 5.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

BY VERNON BARTLET.

From The Contemporary Review (London), July, 1897.

(In two parts.)

PART II.

BUT while at the first Churches and their bishops were not only congregational, but likewise mutually independent, by Cyprian's day inter-ecclesiastical organisation had already developed to some extent, if in differing degrees in different parts of the world. This was a natural and spontaneous outcome of the fraternal spirit, which is the essence of Church life, whether in the local community or in the sum of such communities in which the mystic "Israel of God" attains a visible expression. We see it at work in the sisterly letter of concern addressed by the Roman congregation to Corinth about 96 A.D., when the good name of Christ was being compromised by strife in the latter Church. We see it, too, in the loving help afforded by the Roman Church to more needy sister Churches in various places,¹ the first and most genuinely Christian form of Roman supremacy. But so far no organisation proper, even in a tentative way, is involved. The beginnings of this are only seen in connection with certain common problems of discipline and ritual soon

¹ "Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth," c. 170 A.D. (Euseb. iv. 23).

after the middle of the second century. And here it is most essential to observe the exact nature of these beginnings. It was a most natural thing to wish to take the sense of the Christian consciousness outside of each local Church, especially on fresh issues touching which there was no actual tradition to fall back upon. It was done in more than one way. Dionysius of Corinth, for instance, was consulted, on account of his repute for wisdom, by many Churches in the most various and distant places, with which he could have absolutely no organic relations. But mutual conference of adjacent Churches was an obvious way of gaining the wiser counsel that is given by many heads. And so informal conferences were convened to discuss matters. "At first such conferences were held irregularly. There was no stated time or occasion for them. There was no fixed president. There was no limitation of the area from which their members were drawn."¹ The earliest known instances were simply *ad hoc* conferences, to consider the specific questions of Montanist "prophecy" and the Paschal Controversy. Nor were they mere meetings of church officers, bishops or others. We are told in a contemporary notice² that "the faithful in (the province of) 'Asia', often and in many places of Asia met together on this business," and tried and rejected Montanism as spurious prophecy. Naturally their regular leaders played the chief part on such occasions; and we hear of certain "men approved and bishops" doing the actual cross-examination of Montanists. But none the less the idea is an important one, that "the faithful," as such, co-operated in the decision reached.³ With this

¹ These words of Dr. Hatch, having been challenged, were reaffirmed by Dr. Sanday (*ut supra*, p. 333), who says: "I cannot see anything in this description that is not strictly in accordance with the facts. And when Dr. Hatch goes further, and instances the Council of Ancyra as showing that this state of things lasted on into the fourth century, I cannot dissent." The point of principle here involved is the tentative nature of early inter-congregational association. It was spontaneous and not "authorised" by anything but expediency.

² Cited by Eusebius, v. 16.

³ So the same writer says that he himself, finding the *Ecclesia* in

agrees the language of Tertullian early in the third century, when he speaks of the "Shepherd" of Hermas as having been judged apocryphal "by every Council of churches," and still more emphatically in the following passage: "There are held besides, throughout the Greek world, those Councils in fixed spots composed of whole Churches; whereby both all the higher themes are handled in common and the representation itself of the whole Christian name takes place with great veneration." Of course, the larger the area from which the Churches came, the more the method of indirect representation by the standing officers must have obtained of necessity. Yet the older idea still persists under the changing conditions. Thus the third African Synod on Baptism, in 256 A.D., consisted of bishops, with presbyters and deacons, in the presence of a numerous laity. In North Africa, indeed, the actual voting seems by this time to be confined to the bishops on behalf of their respective congregations. But this was by no means universal. Firmilian of Cappadocia says, in writing to Cyprian, that "each year we assemble presbyters and presidents (bishops) to arrange those things which are entrusted to our care." The synodal letter on Paul of Samosata is in the name of the bishops, presbyters,¹ deacons, and the Churches of the region. While at the Spanish Synod of Elvira, c. 306 A.D., the names of more presbyters than bishops are given in the official acts.

What, then, was the dominant element in ecclesiastical life prior to the fourth century? Not the episcopal as known to-day; for this is diocesan—subordinating many local pastors to one autocratic superintendent—and clerical, in the sense of excluding the laity from

Ancyra of Galatia stirred on the question, "argued on several days in the church assembly, so that the church was exultant and was strengthened in regard to the truth."

¹ *De Jeuniis*, 13: "per Græcias illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis." The former reference is to *De Pudicitia*, 10.

² It was the presbyter Malchion who finally brought Paul to book on this occasion. And Dionysius of Alexandria speaks (Euseb. vii. 7) of decisions on Baptism before his own day "in the most populous churches, and in the synods of the brethren at Iconium and Synada [c. 230 A.D.], and among many."

any real voice in things ecclesiastical. Not the Presbyterian; for this means compulsory subordination of each congregation to the will, first, of adjacent churches (presbytery), and, finally, of all the churches in the territorial communion (General Assembly). Accordingly it is in modern Congregationalism that we find the main features of primitive ecclesiastical polity best reflected. For (1) in both, the unit of organisation is the local church or congregation,¹ with its full complement of officers—bishop, or pastor, and council of colleagues (whether called “presbytery” or “diaconate” is a matter of terms, not actual functions). One and all are elected directly by the church members, “the saints,” or “sacred priesthood,” of New Testament² and primitive thought. (2) In both, discipline is congregational. Thus Cyprian even will not restore to Church fellowship without the people’s consent, even where their view does not quite coincide with his own.³ (3) In both, each Church is also independent. Again Cyprian casts his weight into this scale, as far as usages—even when implying grave matter of principle—are concerned. Thus he definitely declares, in reference to the rebaptism of those baptized by heretics, that each bishop in an African Synod is to give his own opinion without fear of being denied communion in case it be other than that of the majority of his brethren. “For there is none of us who consti-

¹ In neither is this conception taken in a narrow or doctrinaire way. As a third century urban *ecclesia* might have daughter rural *ecclesie* dependent on it, so to-day. Only the modern Congregationalist sees that it is natural for a daughter to *grow up* and herself become adult, perhaps a mother.

² St. Paul, *passim*; 1 Peter ii. 5; Rev. i. 6. Compare several vigorous passages in Bp. Lightfoot’s “Christian Ministry.” This for instance: “the sacerdotal functions and privileges which alone are mentioned in the apostolic writings, pertain to all believers alike and do not refer solely or specially to the ministerial office.”—“Philippians,” 244*f*.

³ Hence the “Church Reform League,” while claiming for the laity “a real control in the appointing of their pastors, and in all matters of ecclesiastical organisation and administration a concurrent voice with the clergy” (“Leaflet,” No. 1, Principle ii.), falls short of primitive principle in excluding the laity from jurisdiction in matters of discipline, in which they are most interested.

tutes himself bishop of bishops,¹ or pushes his colleagues with a tyrannous terror to the necessity of compliance; since every bishop, according to the scope of the liberty and office which belongs to him, has his decision in his own hands, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge his neighbour; but we await one and all the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who one and alone has the power both to promote us in the governing of His Church, and to judge our conduct therein.” This case brings out the principle all the more forcibly that an earlier African Council, of some forty years before, had already declared for the practice which Cyprian approved, but had not been regarded as closing the question. In such matters, at least, the authority of synods was simply moral, so leaving congregational autonomy unimpaired.

The fact is that these meetings were of the nature of voluntary associations, carrying great and just moral weight, but no compulsion save in the case where breach with the elementary doctrinal basis of unity was thought to have taken place. Then, indeed, active communion was withdrawn from the minority or the individual church, as the case might be. But no further pressure, no non-spiritual method of compulsion, was brought to bear; nor was it thought of until the fateful alliance with the State came about. Congregations simply fell out of line with the majority. This is not presbyterianism, much less modern episcopacy; but it is the method of modern Congregationalism, which has its voluntary “county associations” of churches, and its general assembly (the Congregational Union), which has rather more authority than the Church Congress, but no compulsory powers.

3. But it will be said, “All or much of this may be

¹ *I.e.*, as Stephen of Rome was virtually doing by his peremptory tone.

² Speech in opening the third council on baptism: *cf.* Letter in name of its predecessor (ED. 72, 3), repudiating the wish to compel uniformity of practice.

true. Yet the difference of Orders still remains." Touching the supposed indispensable "grace" of episcopal ordination, I can only say that, after having read and weighed all that Canon Gore adduces in his "Church and the Ministry" as evidence for the first three centuries—and it is significant how little this is, compared with that cited from the fourth¹ and fifth—I am impressed by the singular absence of expressions connecting any special grace with the "laying-on of hands." There is one passage, indeed, in "Hippolytus," in the second decade of the third century, possibly going back to an isolated sentence in "Irenæus," which seems to claim a special endowment of the Holy Spirit of truth for bishops, as standing in the apostles' place as primary teachers of the Ecclesia. But there is not a hint that this gift was gained in the act and article of ordination. On the contrary, Irenæus traces the "assured gift of truth," which is in question, to the "good pleasure of the Father," which recalls the direct inspiration attributed to the typical apostle Peter as explanation of his sure grasp on the truth at Cæsarea Philippi, rather than any ritual condition of bestowal. And further, he styles the recipients of such grace "presbyters;" and in the same context goes on to speak of these custodians of apostolic doctrine as being of "the presbyteral order" (*presbyterii ordo*). So that

¹ It is most instructive to note that Canon Gore, while quoting largely from the "Apostolical Constitutions," cites passages from Bk. viii. *alone* for the idea of grace (as opposed to authority) being conferred by the laying-on of episcopal hands. Now Bk. viii. is not earlier than c. 350 A.D. There is, moreover, an altogether earlier form of Bks. i.-vi., from which he never quotes, and from which the larger part of even the "sacerdotal" language cited from Bk. ii. (of the fourth century recension) is wanting.

² "Adv. Hær." iv. 26, 2, "(presbyteri) qui cum episcopatus successionis charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acciperunt."

³ The fact that they are credited with "succession in episcopate" or oversight creates no necessity to narrow the reference to the *presiding* presbyter or bishop. Irenæus' language in such matters is confessedly primitive, and the "presbyters" named in 1 Clement, 44, possess the "episcopate;" while it is quite in keeping with the analogy of his age, witness Clement of Alexandria, to reckon the bishop among the presbyters.

it is unlikely that distinctive episcopal grace is here in his mind at all.

On the whole, then, we have no real evidence that "ordination" for the first three centuries meant more than the solemn institution of a fit person in sacred office, somewhat after the manner of installation into civil office.

"Jewish usage," says Dr. Hort,¹ "in the case of Rabbis and their disciples, renders it highly probable that (as a matter of fact) laying on of hands was largely practised in the Ecclesiæ of the apostolic age as a rite introductory to ecclesiastical office. But as the New Testament tells us no more than what has been already mentioned, it can hardly be likely that any essential principle was held to be involved in it. It was enough that an Ecclesia should, in modern phrase, be organised . . . and that all things should be done decently and in order."

Grace for the special function involved in each office was viewed as already given to the selected candidate, and on this basis he was elected by the Ecclesia. Hence the great stress laid on the requisite qualifications in the New Testament.² Where these were present, ordination could but confer official status. The great thing to the primitive Church was the "testing" of character and spiritual endowment,³ not the formal act of institution with prayer. Striking confirmation of this is found in a rule of about the end of the second century,⁴ that a very small Church should invite the neighbouring Churches to send three select men to help in testing the fitness of the candidates for the episcopate—probably the germ of the three ordaining bishops later in vogue. Here the idea is simply the safeguarding of fitness and order. Similarly Tertul-

¹ "Christian Ecclesia," p. 216, where he examines the layings on of hands in the New Testament, and argues that they afford no real precedents for normal ecclesiastical office.

² E.g. Acts vi. 3, "men of good repute, full of (the) Spirit and wisdom;" and the pictures of the presbyter-bishops and deacons in the Pastoral Epistles.

³ So 1 Clem. 42, where the apostles are said to have appointed (*καθίστατον*) their first converts to the ministry, "having proved them by the Spirit."

⁴ In the "Constitutions of Clement," ch. 15, assigned by the *Church Quarterly* reviewer to Egypt and (for this part) to a date not later than the early third century.

lian' explains that "the difference between the Order (the clergy) and the people is constituted by the authority of the Church and by the consecration of the office (*honor*) indicated by the sitting together of the Order." And so he can continue: "Thus where there is no bench of the ecclesiastical Order, you (a layman) may offer (the eucharistic offerings) and baptize and be your own sole priest." "In his time," says the late archbishop, "the substantive priesthood of the laity was an understood reality. This it was which it was perceived to be foreshown in the Levitic priesthood, not that official priesthood of the clergy which was rightly constituted by the authority of the Church"—and which therefore cannot confer or guarantee special grace. And the same writer has brought out pointedly the fact that Cyprian, while perhaps the first to reimport the Jewish notion of indefeasible prerogatives inherent in a Levitic priesthood, yet did not conceive episcopal sacrosanctness to hinge on ordination, but rather on God's providential choice and calling of the individual to an office of momentous import.¹

Looking back, then, at the ecclesiastical principles of the New Testament, as expounded by Dr. Hort, and at the general features of ante-Nicene organisation, one inquires after the divine sanction for the changes involved in a full-blown Episcopalian system, for which such high claims are often made. By what right did bishops come to rule other bishops, so becoming what Cyprian scornfully styles a "Bishop of Bishops"? By what right were the laity stripped of sacred duties and functions once exercised? Hort has said that "the fundamental nature of the Ecclesia as a community of disciples renders it impossible that the principle (of lay control) should rightly become obsolete"—that the very notion of an organised community postulates

¹ "De Exhort. Cast." 7. I use Archbishop Benson's rendering. He adds ("Cyprian, his Life and Times," p. 20, *note*) that "*Honor* is like *Ordo*, a constitutional word, signifying the office of any magistrate or dignity."

² See the quotation given above, p. 12.

it. Yet obsolete it has become. *Quo jure?* Finally, what principle of Christ or of His apostles warranted the majority of a conference of bishops to coerce a minority, or to refuse to any single congregation the right to fall back on its own conscience and so serve its Lord? If it be replied that it was expedient under the then conditions, one may answer, first, that there are fundamental principles which ought not to be sacrificed to "expediency;" and, secondly, that expediency changes. Amid the general ruin of free institutions that marked the fourth and fifth centuries a certain organisation may have seemed natural to the bulk of Christians. And the same may have fitted well with the autocratic type of mediæval authority and the pupillage of the ruled. But conditions have again changed. Not pupillage, but self-government, that trains the men who have a hand in it, is the ideal of the modern world. And the very fact that a certain type of "historic episcopate" was an integral part of mediæval and feudal England, creates a presumption that it must be profoundly modified by the spirit of religious democracy, if it is to be in vital touch with the soberly democratic England of to-day. But this means some return upon the principles of its own democratic past, those of the ante-Nicene *Ecclesiæ*.

II.

The Pan-Anglican Conference of 1888 expressed the belief that "both from deeper study and from larger historical experience there was in the present day a greater disposition to value and to accept the ancient Church order." The present writer echoes this belief. But he ventures to question the tacit assumption underlying these words—namely, that "the ancient Church order," taken in its most natural sense, and before the closer relations of Church and State under Constantine, corresponds more nearly to modern Episcopacy than to modern Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. To him it appears that the moral of the deeper study

and larger historical experience of our day has been fairly summed up by Dr. Sanday, when he says :¹

"The inquiries which have of late been made into the early history of the Christian ministry seem to me to result in an Eirenicon between the Churches. The inquiries in question do, I think, stand in the way of aggressive partisanship. . . . Our confessional differences are indeed reflected in primitive Christianity, but not as mutually exclusive. They represent not conflicting and irreconcilable conceptions of the original constitution of the Church, but only successive stages in the growth of that constitution. The Church passed through a congregational stage . . . it also passed through a presbyterian stage. If any one wishes to single out these stages and to model the society to which he belongs upon them, he is zealous for a pure and primitive polity; he clings to the Bible and what he finds in the Bible; he will not allow himself to wander far from that ideal which he thinks that Christ and His Apostles have left him."

Here Dr. Sanday is himself speaking of no more than the first century of Christianity. But the principle is the same, and applies with all the greater force, if I have at all succeeded in showing that the congregational stage lasted in the main (with some modifications of form) for nearer three than two centuries.² And when he goes on to say, "I would guard myself against being supposed to imply that what is good once is necessarily good always," he still carries me with him. Only we should, perhaps, apply the principle differently. He would tend to see in episcopacy the "survival of the fittest." I, on the other hand, would dwell on the newer conditions with which its irresponsible "monarchy" ill accords; and, emphasising the danger of a dualism between the genius of the political and ecclesiastical politics in the present, would urge a large infusion of Congregationalism as a pressing need. But the main note of the Eirenicon from both sides is the frank recognition of the relativity of all existing ecclesiastical politics. Each has its own characteristic strength and weakness. And the true problem is this: How to blend the strength of each—Diocesan Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Con-

¹ "Expositor," III. viii. 335f.

² As I understand "presbyterianism," it never came to clear expression in antiquity. But its leading principle, that of a representative aristocracy, was a potent factor. ■

gregationalism—into a finely adjusted polity, so as to minimise the abuses to which each alone is liable.

That this is no academic notion, but something towards which considerable approximations have already taken place, it now concerns me to show. In the first place, then, Episcopalianism has already made some experiment of the sort in certain of our colonies—those freer trial-grounds for new growths—in response to the more democratic influences there prevalent. An account of "The Church in a Colonial (Australian) Diocese" appeared in the *Guardian* of June 5, 1895; and the main points were these. Parochial clergymen are chosen by a joint board of nominators, half being elected by the Diocesan Synod and half by the parish vestry. Similarly, bishops are elected by the Diocesan Synod, subject to the approval of the General Synod, if sitting, or of the standing committees of the other dioceses of the province. The Methodist Episcopal Church of America, again, presents another type of "mixed polity," which recalls the superintendent-bishops of early Scotch Presbyterianism—an institution which some modern Presbyterians would not be disinclined to restore. In Presbyterianism itself the last generation saw a large infusion of the congregational element, in the liberty of choosing their own pastor conceded in practice to each church. On the other hand, the formation, since the beginning of the century, of county associations and of a general Union with half-yearly assemblies, has shown that British Congregationalism is ready to take a leaf out of the Presbyterian book of experience. And the result has been a considerable mutual approach in sympathy and appreciation; while in America the *rapprochement* is even greater.¹

And here we seem to get a hint as to the process by which any more organic union is to come about. The ideal of mere absorption of other bodies by any one polity in its present form may be dismissed, not only as a dream, but as an irreverent dream which ignores

¹ So much so that mutual ministerial eligibility between the two is there quite a recognised thing. :

the voice of God in history.¹ But even the formal federation or fusion of any existing bodies is not the first stage in their union. What one may term the "internal fusion of ideals" is a vital prerequisite, whereby the temper and genius of each is partially appropriated by the other before ever the external fusion is essayed. Now such subtle interpenetration of spirit is going forward silently, but surely, and will bear fruit in due season. This is the encouraging side of the present outlook, the mutual assimilation of one another's root principles without giving up what is positive in one's own traditions.

Its *rationale* is well expressed by Dr. Hort² in writing to Dr. Hatch :

"I quite go with you in condemning the refusal of fellowship with sister Churches merely because they make no use of some element of organisation assumed to be *jure divino* essential. But it seems to me that the rejection of theoretical and practical exclusiveness clears the ground for the recognition of at least the possibility that other kinds of (relative) *jus divinum* may be brought to light by history and experience. In organisation, as in other things, all Churches have much, I think, to learn from each other, the Church of England as much as any. . . . They have all much need of development, but each from its own historical base."

On the other hand, over against this large Protestant Catholicism, docile to the teachings of Divine Providence in modern times, as well as in the remote past, stands the shadow of a *doctrinaire* Catholicism which is a mere clericalism unworthy the noble name of High Churchmanship. This latter is the peculiar prerogative of no one Church and of no one school or party in a Church. It exists in all those who feel that the Christian society, in any one of its many forms and in them all, has a high function to perform in the economy of human redemption ; and who are ready to sacrifice personal wishes in order to foster its fellowship as

¹ The American Protestant Episcopal Church in 1886 stated emphatically that it did "not seek to absorb other Communion but to co-operate with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, and to discountenance schism." This is surely the true attitude for each communion until a more truly comprehensive type of Order than any existing one shall begin to emerge.

² "Life and Letters," ii. 357.

defined by Christ and His apostles. It is being grievously wounded to-day unawares in the house of its friends. For to some it identifies itself with High Clericalism; to others it largely defines itself by contrast thereto. But surely those who set up conditions which, to say the least, can claim no explicit sanction in words of the Church's Founder, have most to answer for in relation to such lack of unity as exists among us. At a time when non-episcopal Churches at home are showing not only a growing desire, but also a capacity for closer mutual relations; and when, on the other side, Roman Catholicism has shut the door with a bang against overtures in that direction; is it not about time for the Anglican Church to reconsider the whole situation afresh and right to the bottom?

What modifications in the notion and methods of their "historic episcopate" (once very differently regarded by Churchmen) are they really ready to allow to historic and present facts and to Christian unity? The possible presence of a Russian orthodox bishop as a visitor at an Anglican synod does not carry one very far towards union. If a Jansenist archbishop finds the Anglican ministry wanting in that very "sacerdotal" character which a large part of its clergy make the middle-wall of division between themselves and fellow English Christians whom they will not recognise as forming Churches of Christ, is it likely that the great Russian Church will be more complaisant? It comes back again to this: that the High Anglicans court those who repudiate their Catholicism, and on the ground of this very repudiated Catholicism repulse those at their very doors who approach them with respect.

Meantime we rejoice to believe that the blind instinct towards greater unity is itself growing, and will in due time see its way more clearly. Truer methods

¹ "The Established Church of England knows nothing of a sacrificing priest in the Catholic sense, as her Thirty-nine Articles and other declarations prove. . . . Until the Anglicans reject their Thirty-nine Articles there can be no question of reunion between us and them."—Archbishop of Utrecht.

of exegesis and a truer historic sense are gaining ground; and it is hardly too much to hope that books like Dr. Hort's careful discussion of the original conception of the Ecclesia of Christ, which is really assumed in all our thoughts and words on Church unity, but is seldom made a topic of serious study, may help to hasten the day of clearer light and larger charity.

THE SECRET OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.

BY W. ROBERTSON NICOLL.

From *The British Weekly* (London), July 8, 1897.

(*In two parts.*)

PART II.

III.

I PROPOSE next to say something about the Evangelical revival and the controversy between William Law and John Wesley. The study of William Law has lately been renewed among us, mainly by the labours of Dr. Whyte. His works have been reprinted in a cheap and complete form, and another divine justly honoured by the Evangelical Church, the Rev. Andrew Murray, has followed Dr. Whyte in publishing a selection from Law's books. No competent judge can doubt for a moment Law's intellectual greatness, his acuteness in argument, his power and charm of style. His was also a very high and leading religious mind, religious, perhaps, rather than Christian. It is with diffidence that one dissents in any way from those who have lately brought Law's works before Christian readers. But it is fair to say that since Wesley's time Evangelical theologians have looked askance at much in his writings, and I venture to think justly. Law is what may be called an extra biblical writer, in

this respect resembling John Foster and differing from John Bunyan. Bunyan's writings are saturated with the Scriptures. He says himself, "I was never out of the Bible," and his mind fastened upon it "as a horse-leech on the vein." Law like Foster gathered a few great ideas from Scripture, and both used their powerful faculties for the illumination and enforcement of these. Law does not quote the Bible very frequently, nor very correctly, and he assumes the right of interpreting expressions which do not suit his system in a sense peculiar to himself. In that very striking book, "The Penfolk," Mr. Gilmour describes for us a disciple of Law who says: "I dinna often quote frae Scripture, for it is like a fiddle; ye can play any tune on it to people." Law evidently held the view, described by Robertson Smith as the essence of rationalism, that revelations of God are given additional to the Scripture. He said of Wesley that he and the Pope were under the same necessity of condemning and anathematising the mystery of God revealed by Jacob Behmen. Law's theology is extremely difficult to characterise justly, and I venture to think that the existing attempts in this direction are unsatisfactory. You have first of all to remember that he to a certain extent altered his positions from time to time, never so far as I know admitting any great change of opinion. What is far more difficult is that he continually uses Scriptural and theological language in a sense of his own which may very easily be misunderstood. I think it would be difficult to draw a perfectly consistent scheme from Law's books, to reconcile, for example, his doctrine of apostolic succession and the sophistical ribaldry on the Invisible Church which are to be found in his letters to the Bishop of Bangor with his letters to a lady who proposed to join the Church of Rome. But on certain points he is clear, and these points are so vital to Evangelicalism that I cannot understand those who can see no ground for Wesley's criticism. Let me give a few quotations. "The one only work of Christ as the Redeemer is to raise into life the smothered spark of heaven in you."

"The atonement of the Divine wrath and justice, and the extinguishing of sin in the creature are only different expressions of the same thing." When Wesley complained that Law grounded nothing on "faith in His blood," Law replied, "What is faith in His blood but a hearty willingness and a full desire wholly to cease or turn away from all heathenish or Jewish practice?" Writing against the doctrine of justification by faith alone, Law triumphantly quotes from Christ's words at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock," the rock according to Law being not the saying, but the doing of the sayings. In fact, he goes so far as to say expressly that when St. Paul speaks of works as unprofitable for salvation he means only Jewish or heathenish works. In his later days he used to speak passionately against the idea of there being any such thing as the wrath of God. When confronted by the overwhelming Scripture testimony he coolly replied that the expressions were all figurative, and yet he speaks in the most orthodox way of Christ being the atonement and satisfaction for sin. One has to read him carefully and closely before discovering that he does not mean by these expressions what the Apostles meant, or what the Church has meant. In the strict sense Law was a legalist, but he is saved by his singularly firm hold of the truth that all life in the creature must come from the birth of the holy nature of God. No one insisted more than he did on the sublimity of what the Christian life may be and ought to be, and on the supernatural powers that are available for reaching that height. An extremely able, but as I venture to think not too scrupulous, controversialist, Law never hesitated, never admitted himself to be in the wrong, and treated all differences not indeed with personal acrimony, but with a cold disdain. Nevertheless it cannot be doubted by any one who looks into the subject that if Wesley had continued to be a disciple of William Law the evangelical revival, so far as it depended on Wesley, would never

have existed. When Wesley broke from Law he struck on the way of salvation. It was Peter Bohler who led Wesley into the truth. "Herein is a mystery, here the wise men of the world are lost. Let Thy blood be a propitiation for me." Ever after when Wesley talked of the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, he spoke of it as the inmost mystery of the faith. Christ loved His own body less than His mystical body the Church, and therefore gave the former for the latter. Wesley never admitted, and we must never admit, that the doctrine of satisfaction can be made perfectly accessible to the human reason. St. Paul leads us not into the regions of common sense, but into those of profound and awful mystery. Only it is to be maintained that by actual spiritual trial we may know the doctrine and prove it, and live by it, and experience the blessing of justification. We may understand how the Church lives in the strength of her one perpetual oblation and sacrifice, and why the awful Apocalyptic voices do not cease to cry, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain." The spirit in which Wesley contemplated the great life-giving truth is expressed in his own quotation from Madame Schurmann's pamphlet. "It is precious to those who feel the weight of their sins, who know that they are by nature children of wrath, and at the same time utterly incapable either of paying the debt or rising from the death of sins, of conquering themselves, the world, and the devil, or meriting eternal life."

Yet Law's views have commended themselves from opposite sides to well-accredited evangelical divines. Dr. Whyte, on his side, has done the Church lasting service by his profound consciousness of sin, by the keenness with which he recognises the frailty that clings to even the best works of man, by the sharpness with which he realises the sense of personal guilt. Law's teaching about human nature and about the Divine requirement have taken hold of him, and greatly reinforced a tendency that already existed. We need such preaching, and we never needed it more than at a time when the corruption of human nature is preached

not so much by believing men as by great unbelieving teachers like Ibsen. Many of us have fallen into the Roman error of thinking, if we do not dare to say, that the corruption of human nature is monstrously exaggerated, a doctrine from which the idea of super-erogation naturally springs. But there is a danger in the truer view. It is the danger of forgetting in the torturing consciousness of sin the true and everlasting distinction between those who are justified and those who are not justified. If justification and pardon are confounded, Christians will come to believe that when pardon needs renewal, justification needs renewal also. They will come to think that they are in as unsheltered and perilous a state as they were before reconciliation. The end will be a dejection and weariness of the soul utterly foreign to the buoyancy and triumph of the Apostles, a shrinking from the great language which it becomes the redeemed of the Lord to use. It is true that in all things we offend and come short, but it is true also that to those who believe in Jesus there is granted a great and permanent blessing that cannot be touched by the infirmities, follies, and sins which are daily confessed, and daily need forgiveness. Justification is reduced to insignificance and worthlessness if day by day we can be thrown back into the wretchedness of being under the Divine condemnation.

No preaching can be fully evangelical which does not recognise in every part the infinite significance of this separation. Dr. Dale said with much truth that the great secret of Mr. Spurgeon's power was that he was always fully conscious of his own full justification before God. There are those before the preacher who in Christ are justified. They are to be called to sanctification. There are those who are not justified, and they are to be told that they cannot sanctify themselves, and that their first step is to enter by faith into the condition in which they are accepted in the Beloved as righteous, in which they enter into what is rather unity than union with Christ, in which all the sanctifying forces of the Holy Ghost work upon their souls. And it has to be continually realised that in

the Christian experience the sense of personal guilt and the sense of personal deliverance ought not to be severed. If there is no sense of personal guilt, the experience will be at the very best superficial, and if there is no sense of personal deliverance, the experience will be one of groaning and burden, an experience in which the soul is an exile from the joy of our Lord.

On the other hand, Mr. Murray is attracted by Law's call to perfection, and his high standard of Christian holiness. Of Mr. Murray's teaching generally I have no right to speak, but he is more or less identified in the public mind with the school of teachers who proclaim that a higher Christian life is accessible. He mistakes in the most amazing way the ground of Wesley's severance from Law. These theologians for the most part make comparatively little of the satisfaction of Christ to the Divine justice, though some of them honestly accept it. They get rid of the sense of guilt. They do not seem to have much or anything to confess. They have doubtless done great service in showing that Christians are prone to rest satisfied with a lower degree of attainment and joy than that which Christ has made possible. That we should ceaselessly aspire to be altogether hopeful, altogether loving, altogether believing, altogether Christian—that is the will of God. And it is right to acknowledge that the Scriptures plainly teach us that experiences which many of us have never shared are possible to the soul that trusts in Christ. We must not make too much of sin or allow it to obscure the effects of grace. We must not deny that great victories have been won by the Spirit of God in human souls. Who can forget the tenderness, the triumph, the quick hope with which the Holy Ghost through the mouth of His servants welcomes every victory over evil? But there are grave dangers of forgetting that we cannot atone either by sorrow or by righteousness, that it is on the finished work of Christ, and on that alone, that we must rely. These teachers so far as I know, like Law, insist on the fact that all Christian graces are the fruits of the Spirit of Christ, but even though they are, they no

more avail for salvation than if they were not. It is possible to dwell on these graces until we actually rest upon them for our salvation, and seem to lose the very need of pardon. As to whether perfection may be attained in this life it is not necessary to dogmatise. Doubtless the Divine Spirit may subdue and ennoble our disordered natures beyond what may easily be deemed possible. It is a question of experience, and it may be that many of us are of opinion after years and years of communion with them that certain human beings have attained perfection, the perfection that reveals the quality and power of a life that is higher than the earthly. But even if it is so, how could those spirits claim to be perfect? If they were perfect they would be perfect in a kind, pure, self-forgetfulness that would not know its perfection. Such people as I have spoken of are quite unconscious of the goodness of which they are the temples. As to those who profess to be perfect, it is but just to say that they usually make the claim with faltering lips. But has the claim ever been allowed? Is the type of character formed at perfection meetings even up to the ordinary standard of the Christian character? Is it not rather the type of a Christianity which has turned to pietism? And the pietistic morality is piety. Morality in the pietistic view is the sanctification of the individual. In this form of religion the real problem is not dealt with. Pietism does not face life and conquer it, and throw the many-chambered mansions of the soul into one. Resting upon its own achievement it becomes a kind of Christian endæmonism.

In short, one error is common to both schools. They look within and not without—one on indwelling sin and the other on indwelling righteousness. To say that Christ came merely to reveal a higher morality is to be outside of Christianity. For then He would have come to thrust the world into a deeper condemnation. But, blessed be His Name, He came not to condemn the world, but that the world, through Him, might be saved. I know no Christian teacher who maintains that Christianity is a system of ethics. But

many forget that, when He declared His saving purpose, He went on, and that in the very budding and beginning of His career, to explain how it was to be effected. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "It is not in our own wounds," says Vinet, "but in the wounds of Jesus that we must put our hands." And for us there is no merit but the merit of His atoning sacrifice.

IV.

Much has been necessarily omitted in this brief survey, but enough perhaps has been said to show that in a genuine and normal Christian experience the elements described by Bunyan are still present as much as ever. There is first of all justification by faith by reliance on the finished work of Christ. We have in St. Paul's doctrine not merely a testimony against human merit and self-righteousness. We have not only the true ground, but the true mode of our justification by faith—a faith which works by love. As to the ground there is no time to notice the controversy raised among Evangelicals as to the active and passive obedience of Christ. Writing against O'Brien, Birks said that Christ was not a substitute in His active obedience to the law of God. That obedience was a privilege and not an evil or a burden, and to be set free from obedience would be a curse and no blessing. Perhaps it would be better to say that all Christ's obedience on earth was an Action and a Passion. Anyhow, it is upon a work outside of ourselves and unaffected by the fluctuation of our moods that our justification depends. This is a truth which ought to have more place in Christian experience, and I know no more powerful exposition of it than in Dora Greenwell's "Colloquia Crucis." She delights in all statements, however naked and literal, that bring the judicial aspect of Christ's work into full relief. At the very centre of Christianity in her view lie the doc-

trines of intervention and substitution. They are the glorious alphabet of Christianity. They may be stammered over, travestied, and vulgarised as by children in a village school, and yet they contain within them all poetry, all eloquence, in their sublimest and tenderest range. We are to take our deliverance as a settled axiom of the soul, as a certainty which remains valid whether we for the moment realise it or not. The Cross and faith in the work wrought upon the Cross is a root that can spring out of a dry ground. "Show Thy servants Thy work" is among the deepest of prayers.

And the next element of Christian experience is joy in the Holy Ghost. When the heart truly joins itself to Christ's great sacrifice and to Christ Himself it can dare and endure all things. It becomes strong, free, untrammelled, unperturbed. It lays hold upon Christ in the fulness of His self-communicating grace. It enters into the kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. But it does not depend even then on the rise and fall of ecstatic feeling. If the Divine act of justification is the bestowal of ecstasy the very foundation of justification is shaken, and growth in sanctification ceases. The true doctrine is that through the gate of God, the Meritorious Sacrifice, the soul enters into the great and comforting reality of pardon and acceptance, into the love and peace and joy of believing, and the Holy Ghost is made to it the Lord and Giver of life. By Him it subdues kingdoms, works righteousness, obtains promises. By Him it knits and binds together the every day and the everlasting. Nevertheless it has its sorrows, its failures, its crucifixions, its forsakings, its despairs.

For there is present evermore that aching sense of shortcoming. If we consent to the presence of sin without striving, without repentance, without grief, or if we lower the standard of perfection till it is within our reach, we are guilty of errors which have the same root and the same fruit. Nevertheless the normal Christian life is the simultaneous presence in the soul

of grace and peace, and of the consciousness of sin, and by virtue of our union with Christ we who are still sinners are nevertheless justified, and partakers of the peace of God. So we utterly condemn, slight, and abhor our own righteousness. We slight it as a possible ground of justification before God. We slight it for what it is in itself. Our best achievement is nothing in the face of the eternal Throne—so stained is it, so faultful, so sinful in every part. If He will but draw the red line of His blood through the hopeless reckoning of our life! And so it comes that at death believers ever gaze towards the Cross, not to the Crown. The word they need is, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness—and to their righteousness—and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." It is difficult in a time like this which takes the fact of salvation so easily to understand how hard the first Christians found it to believe, and how strong was the consolation which God administered them. Remember how the Apostle assured his trembling hearers of the awful, incredible wonder of the great salvation. "Wherefore God willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." "I die," said one of your own ministers, "resting on oaths and covenants and blood." He utterly abhorred, slighted, and contemned his own righteousness. Over the grave where the body of William Carey waits the Redeemer's return are the words so dear to our fathers,

"A guilty, weak, and helpless worm
On Thy kind arms I fall;
Be Thou my strength and righteousness,
My Jesus and my all."

THE NEW SAYINGS OF CHRIST.

BY M. R. JAMES.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), August, 1897.

MR. GRENFELL and Mr. Hunt have presented the world in general with a document of the greatest interest; while to theological scholars they have given one of the prettiest problems conceivable, in the writing which they have christened "*Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*." Egypt is constantly yielding up fragments which excite and tantalise us almost unbearably; and now she has surpassed herself. Here we have what purport to be fresh sayings of the most important person who ever lived; and these are preserved to us on a single leaf of papyrus, badly mutilated, and, as a glance at the facsimile will show, extremely hard to read.

During the next few months we may expect edition after edition of these *Logia* from England, France, and Germany. We shall have conjectures good, bad, and worse than bad, on the text, and we shall be told what the fragment is, when and where it was composed, what the lost portions contained, what the surviving portions mean, and what the relation of it all is to our four Gospels. But though we shall certainly learn a good deal, and probably be enabled to fill up the gaps in the second page of the text, I doubt whether we shall get any work that is on the whole more cautious and sensible than the *editio princeps*.

It is not the purpose of this article to answer any of the great questions in Christian "origins" which are sure to be raised in connection with this fragment. The time is not ripe for that. The process of assimilation of new documents is always a long one; and a document so new as the *Logia* demands years rather than weeks or months for its proper appreciation. That which on a first reading seems so unlike anything we have seen—which stands out so sharply from the background of known Christian literature—will eventu-

ally, no doubt, find its context and its environment, and drop into them naturally ; but that will not be for some time to come.

It is, however, already possible to point out what the fragment is not, and to indicate the directions in which the nearest parallel to it may be found ; and that is what I shall attempt to do in the following pages.

I.

In the first place, then, this document is not a leaf of a Gospel—not, at least, of such a Gospel as we know anything about.

A great many kinds of books have been called Gospels at different times, but no extant recension or fragment of any of these leads us to suppose that they had room for such a collection of detached sayings as is contained in the leaf from Oxyrhynchus. Of the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, a book which has been mentioned in connection with this fragment, we possess certain scraps, the chief one being a dialogue of our Lord with Salome ; and from Hippolytus and Epiphanius we learn that it contained esoteric utterances of Christ to the Apostles. The *Gospel of Philip*, of which we have one fragment, seems to have been a "Gnostic" writing, very much like the *Pistis Sophia*, an extant work which represents Philip as the special recorder of the teaching of Jesus after the Resurrection. The very title of the *Gospel of Eve*, again, transports us into a visionary sphere totally unconnected with the earthly life of our Lord ; and the solitary quotation from it, preserved by Epiphanius, confirms the impression we derive from the title. Furthermore, we know enough of the Gospels called *of the Hebrews*, *of the Twelve*, *of the Ebionites*, *of Peter*, to see that in form at least they resembled our Canonical Gospels ; while those *of James* and *of Thomas* we actually possess—the first, perhaps, in its original shape, the latter in a shortened form—and we know that they dealt with the parentage and infancy of Christ by way of direct narrative, with little of direct doctrinal utterance.

Another class of Gospels was that connected with the names of individual heretics—for example, Basilides and Marcion. Marcion's Gospel, however, is well known to have been a mutilated form of St. Luke, while the attribution to Basilides of anything purporting to be a Gospel is in all probability a mistake.

All this goes to show that the books known as Gospels were of a systematic and coherent character, and were either lives of Christ or continuous reports of His teaching, not collections of sayings which had no internal bond of connection with each other.

If one were forced to fix on some one of the spurious Gospels whose names are known to us as the source of the *Logia*, I think I should suggest the *Traditions* or *Gospel of Matthias* as the most likely. We have three short quotations from it, all of which are ethical precepts; and almost all the writers who speak of it are connected with Egypt. Yet I do not think it really probable that our sayings are a part of this book. The formula "Jesus saith," which serves to introduce each saying in our fragment, is not very suitable to an apostle recording his reminiscences of his Master's words. There are, besides, indications that Matthias, in company with Philip and Thomas, was represented by the Egyptian Gnostics as a special recipient of Christ's esoteric teachings after the Resurrection, a fact which makes it probable that, if we had the *Gospel of Matthias*, we should find it to be a book of the same general character as the *Pistis Sophia*.

In the next place, this fragment does not belong to the work which people often describe as the *Logia of Papias*.

It should be remembered that the work of Papias was not called *Logia*, but *Expositions of Logia of the Lord* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις); and both the title and the remains of the book indicate that the proportion of "expositions" which it contained must have been largely in excess of *Logia*. Its form, too, must have been more elaborate than that of the new fragment. However small in intelligence Papias may have been (and Eusebius thought him very small), he had

some pretensions to graces of style. It is difficult to imagine that he would have incorporated in his book a section so very unliterary and so miscellaneous in character as this is without diluting it with some measure of exposition. However, it is wasting time to prove that this fragment cannot be from Papias. One has but to read the specimens we have of his work to be convinced that it was of a widely different complexion. And if we may extend our purview to the fragments quoted from "the Presbyters" by Irenæus, some of which are pretty certainly from the *Expositions* of Papias, we shall probably realise that the question is hardly worth debating.¹

What, then, is this fragment? It may be a collection of sayings of our Lord made at a time when Gospels were only beginning, or had not yet begun, to be written. It may be a collection of extracts from one or more written Gospels. Does the form of it help us to a conclusion?

¹ Shall we ever recover a copy of the five books of Papias? Egypt has seemingly unlimited possibilities, and may yet give them up. Syria, too, is not entirely exhausted; and there may have been a Syriac version of the work, though I do not know that any mention of such a thing has been brought to light. But in the West, what are our chances? We know that in or about 1218 the church of Nîmes possessed a "thick volume," containing *Librum Papiæ, Librum de Verbis Domini*. To be sure, this may have been a copy of the Lexicon of the Papias who lived in the eleventh century, bound up with a copy of Augustine *De Verbis Domini*. Still, it is not very likely that those two books would be bound up along with other tracts in one volume; and, after all, the Latin version of Irenæus comes to us from the South of France, and the second-century dialogue of Jason and Papias was translated into Latin by a cleric in that part of the world. So that, on the whole, it is most probable that that *was* a true Papias in Latin at Nîmes, though it is not there now.

I am not at all sure that there may not have been a copy in England also in the fifteenth century. John Boston, the Bury monk and bibliographer, includes Papias of Hierapolis in the list of writers whose works he had seen in monastic libraries. But not all Boston's work is in print, and, until it is, we shall not know whether he actually did see the book, or whether he merely put down the name because it occurred in Jerome's catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, which is one of his chief sources.

Almost every considerable monastic library catalogue contains two or three mentions of Papias; but in all these cases it is fairly certain that the author of the dictionary is meant.

The leaf which we have is marked with the number 11; and if it be at all fair to build anything on such meagre data, I would say that it seems likely that all the ten preceding leaves contained matter similar to this: because ten leaves of the size of ours would not contain any important writing to which this could be an appendix.

Then, again, if we look at the structure of the document, it is very difficult to make it fit into any class of sacred writings of which we have any specimens. The repeated formula, "Jesus saith," is so bare, so jejune, that one cannot conceive its occurring in any book which contained anywhere portions of narrative. It would not, however, be inappropriate either to a series of extracts from a larger book, or to a collection of sayings which contained sayings and nothing else.

Now I suppose it to be true that books composed exclusively of precepts or "gnomic" utterances are distinctively Oriental in character. Certain it is that in looking for parallels to the *Logia*, so far as form is concerned, we find the most striking general resemblances in writings like the Jewish *Pirke Aboth*, or *Sayings of the Fathers*. If we turn over the pages of this, we are constantly met by the simple formulæ, "Abtalion said;" "Shammai said;" "Rabbi said;" "He used to say." The Greek collections, such as Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Laconica*, are not of the same kind. They consist of a series of short anecdotes, which specify the circumstances that gave rise to the saying.

It is probable enough that the literature of Persia and India would supply striking resemblances alike in form and substance to the document we are discussing. These, if they exist, will be produced in due time. At present I merely wish to indicate that it is a possibility that this papyrus leaf is from a collection of sayings made as such, and not collected from larger works.

Yet in this case the introductory formula is puzzling. We should expect the past tense—*ἔλεγεν* or *εἶπεν*, "He used to say," or "He said," not "He saith." In the *Pirke Aboth* the past tense is always employed,

and, indeed, it seems almost inevitable that it should be employed when we are recording either traditions or personal reminiscences. The difficulty may not strike others as important; to me it is a real one.

I do not, however, find that the same objection applies, if we may regard the fragment as a series of excerpts made for some purpose from a larger work or works. I can acquiesce in the recurrence of the bare words "Jesus saith," if I am allowed to think of them as merely paragraph-marks to distinguish one saying from another. I could fancy them to correspond to the familiar *ὅτι* with which Greek epitomisers, such as Photius, begin each new extract from the book they are abridging.

I can also understand them very well if the collection was meant for liturgical use of any kind; if, for instance, they are analogous to the formula, "Hear also what St. Paul saith," in our Communion service. I do not, of course, mean that the collection was made to be used in a Church service, as are the "comfortable words" to which I have alluded: but I can very well imagine that a Christian teacher should make a collection of utterances of our Lord from various sources, which he might read or quote to a circle of hearers as occasion served him.¹

May I, then, with all due diffidence, set up the theory that this papyrus leaf is from a book of sayings of Christ, extracted from one or more Gospels, and leave it to be dealt with by the critics as it deserves?

II.

Something has been said of the form of the fragment; the great question of its contents has now to be approached. Are these new sayings to be regarded as probably genuine words of Christ? I think every one must be impressed by them. In the case of one

¹ One only of the uncanonical sayings of Christ collected by Resch (*Agrapha*, No. 47) resembles ours in form. It is preserved by Origen, and runs thus: *καὶ Ἰησοῦς γοῖν φησὶν διὰ τοὺς ἀσθενούντας ἡσθένουν καὶ διὰ τοὺς πενώντας ἐπεινών καὶ διὰ τοὺς διψώντας ἰδίψων.*

or two of them the first feeling is that they justify the high claim they make. Is this claim borne out by further examination of their meaning, and by such external evidence as can be brought to bear on them?

With those sayings which are most closely allied to matter in the Canonical Gospels it would not be right for any one to deal who has not a special knowledge of the Synoptic question. Only it may be suggested by such a one that the proverb, "*noscitur a sociis*," has some application here. It is something in favour of the new sayings that they are found in company with the old. Something, not everything. The forger is well advised, it may be answered, who does not trust entirely to his own powers of invention, but uses some materials at least which he finds ready to his hand. On the other hand, if these *Logia* can be in any sense described as a forgery, they are a forgery of a class totally new to us.

The theory advanced above, that they may be excerpts from one or more Gospels—such, for example, as the *Egyptian Gospel*—would serve well to explain the presence in them side by side of elements of various degrees of authenticity; for it is most probable that those early Gospels which the Church rejected contained an admixture of genuine matter along with some that was corrupt and some that was pure invention.

The second saying in the fragment runs thus: "Except ye fast [to] the world, ye shall not find the kingdom of God: and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father." The expression rendered "fast to the world" (*νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον*), if allowable at all, is, as the editors say, very harsh. A doubt as to the correctness of the reading *κόσμον* (the world) is natural, though it is hazardous to try and amend the work of two experienced readers of papyri: I frankly allow that I can suggest nothing better. Yet something in the nature of a parallel to "the Sabbath" in the second clause is rather needed—say, the name of a day of the month or week, or of some Jewish fast. However, as the name of a day (analogous to *τεσσα-*

ρακοστή) would in all cases require the feminine gender, and, as no name of a fast will suit the *ductus litterarum*, κόσμον must stand for the present. If it stands, and if the saying is to be looked upon as genuine, we must assign to it, I think, a spiritual and not a temporal meaning. The finding of the kingdom is contingent upon keeping the true fast—the fast that God has chosen; the sight of the Father is to be attained by keeping the true Sabbath. On the other hand, literally interpreted, these words are not the teaching of Christ. He who said, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," could never have made the Jewish observance which He broke down the necessary step to the attainment of the heavenly life. Rather, in that case, must the words embody the principle of some Judaising or Jewish-Gnostic sect; they can never have been uttered by our Lord.

The third saying is the most immediately attractive of all.

"Jesus saith: I stood in the midst of the world, and in flesh was I seen of them: and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of man, because they are blind in their heart."

Where must we suppose these words to have been said? Must they be placed in the days after the Resurrection? If so, the presumption that they came from a Gnostic source is very strong; for the early heretical teachers and writers of Apocalypses appropriated that period to themselves, and represented it as the time *par excellence* when Christ communicated His most important revelation to His chosen disciples. The *Pistis Sophia*, the *Books of Jeu*, the *Questions of Bartholomew*, and the *Apocalypse of Peter* (as it seems) all have their scenes laid in these days.

It is perhaps significant that a rather striking reminder of this saying does occur in the *Pistis Sophia*:

"Now when the disciples heard this, they fell down and worshipped Him, saying: 'Help us, our Lord, have pity on us, that we may be delivered from these evil chastisements, which are prepared

for the sinners. Woe unto them, woe unto them, the sons of men, for they shall be as blind men groping in darkness, not seeing. Have pity on us, Lord, in this great blindness wherein we are, and have pity upon the whole race of men,' etc."—(Schwartz's translation, p. 232).

The notion of the blindness of the whole human race, and of the compassion of Christ for them, is what is common to the two passages.

But I do not feel certain that this saying is necessarily to be placed on the post-Resurrection period. It might, I think, be of the nature of a parable. It reminds one of the words of our Lord (Matt. xxiv. 28 ; Luke xvii. 26) about the condition of the world in the days of Noah (and Lot). The point of these sayings is, of course, a different one ; it lies in the suddenness of the destruction that came upon the careless livers ; yet a certain similarity exists.

The difficulty of regarding the words as uttered before the Resurrection lies in the past tense used, and in the phrase, " In flesh was I seen of them," a phrase, by the way, which has a markedly Johannine look. Even this, however, would be tolerable in a parable such as that in Matthew xxv., in which the Son of Man says, " I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat," etc. It is not, certainly, often that our Lord refers to His coming upon earth as a past event ; still, He does so refer to it ; and I would submit that it is very possible that in this saying we have a reminiscence, perhaps garbled, but preserving a genuine element, of a parable or simile actually uttered by Christ. In any case, the saying is a very beautiful one.

The last of these *Logia* to which I can here refer is that puzzling sentence, " Raise up the stone, and there thou shalt find me ; cleave the wood, and there am I."

It seems to me that there are three possible lines of interpretation for this :

(1) Christ is everywhere and in everything. This, as Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have said, is favoured by the near neighbourhood of what seems to be a form of the utterance, " Where two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst of them," and the

sentence from the *Gospel of Eve*, which Epiphanius has preserved, supplies an attractive illustration.

(2) The emphasis is to be laid upon the hard and laborious character of the acts prescribed—the heaving up of the stone and the cleaving of the wood. We should then have a parallel to the precept, "*Ask*, and ye shall receive; *seek*, and ye shall find; *knock*, and it shall be opened unto you;" an utterance in which the command seems to me quite as important an element as the promise. Effort is necessary if the knowledge of Christ is to be won.

(3) The "stone" and the "wood" may just possibly be the important factors in the saying. Both of them are familiar types of the Lord. But I cannot give a satisfactory meaning to the whole clause on this hypothesis, though it seems just worth mentioning.

The first interpretation has a flavour of Pantheism about it, of something far removed from the ordinary lines of our Lord's genuine sayings. If the interpretation be correct, the words would better suit a "Gnostic" *milieu* than an orthodox one. But I doubt its correctness. Would any sect which is likely to have produced this mystical saying have put it in such a form? Were they not all too deeply imbued with a belief in the inherent evil of matter? Stone and wood, the productions of an ignorant or evil Creator, with whose works it is the object of every enlightened soul to have as little to do as possible, could they be spoken of in so emphatic a manner as this? I do not think that a Gnostic would thus conceive of the presence of Christ in created things. The Lord "is everywhere and heareth every one of us," say the Docetic *Acts of John*, it is true; but there is no hint to show that He is present in inanimate things of sense.

I incline rather to the second of the interpretations suggested above. It is direct and simple, and it is in accordance with Christ's known teaching. Possibly the collector of the *Logia* may have understood the sentence differently, and therefore placed it in the position in which we find it. If he did, he acted, I believe, under a misapprehension.

With these scattered suggestions I must leave the fragment. The interest of this first-fruit of the Oxyrhynchus find cannot easily be exaggerated. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have already earned our warmest thanks by the way in which they have dealt with it; and during many years to come, one is glad to think, they will be constantly increasing our obligations alike to themselves and to the Egyptian Exploration Fund.

SOME NOTES ON THE LOGIA.

BY PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS.

From *The Independent* (New York), July 29, 1897.

THE interest which has been aroused by the discovery of this single leaf by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt is not likely to subside without leaving some permanent effects. As in most cases where early Christian documents have been brought to light, there is necessarily something of a superficial excitement which is followed by a measure of disappointment when it is found that the document does not disclose at once all the secrets that belong to the foundations of the literature of the Christian Church. In the present case, however, it is almost impossible that disappointment can be a prevailing sentiment when it is realized that, in all probability, an accretion has been made to the most authoritative side of our Lord's teaching, and this accretion betrays the fact that a large part of that teaching, perhaps as much as two-thirds, has passed into comparative oblivion. It is very unlikely that the Christian Church will let the matter rest with the recovery of the eleventh page of a book of Christ's own sayings. They will resume the often faltering interest in Eastern research and insist that more of these sand-covered, dust-mounded documents shall be brought to light, either at Oxyrhynchus or elsewhere. There will be a revival of Oriental and especially of Egyptian research

both in England and America, we may be certain. And this will be stimulated still further by the successive publications which will announce other treasures of Greek literature from the masses of papyri in the hands of the Oxford scholars. The next direction in which the presence of the new document will make itself felt is in the study of the origins and of the text of the New Testament.

First of all, it intrudes itself into the domain of the Christian evidences. It shows us that the hypothesis of primitive collections of Christ's sayings, underlying our existing Gospels and reaching beyond the units of our existing Gospels is a *vera causa*. It may be and must be used to explain phenomena in the early Christian literature.

Take, for example, the report which Papias makes with regard to the Gospels current in his own day—shall we say about the year 125 A.D. ? It has been the custom to quote the words, "Matthew wrote the Logia in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated them as he best was able," as a proof of the currency of the Gospel of Matthew in the beginning of the second century. Or if this was denied, the denial was complicated, and consequently weakened by a want of definite knowledge as to what was meant by Logia. For instance, a recent anonymous writer on the subject, defective in scholarship, but vigorous in imagination, maintained the theory that the oracles of Papias were Old Testament oracles, in fact a collection of testimonies which was the ancestor of many of those collections against the Jews of which we find the traces in Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian and Cyprian. How was this to be disproved, when no scrap of Logia could be certainly appealed to ? Now it is clear from the fragment, that collections of Oracles of Jesus did exist ; the formula *Ἰησοῦς λέγει* with which they are introduced is a sufficient warrant to the Oxford editors for placing the words *λόγια Ἰησοῦ* at the head of their tract. But if such collections existed, then we can no more affirm with any confidence that we have the evidence of Papias in favor of the canonical Gospel of

Matthew. He must have been (or at least we must allow that he may have been) speaking of a collection of sayings and not of a written Gospel, especially if we find evidence that these sayings were originally written in a Hebrew dialect; that is to say, a very strong evidential bulwark of the antiquity of the Gospel of Matthew has collapsed. Nor will the matter end there; for Papias goes on to speak of a work which had been written by Mark, the interpreter of Peter, and he apologizes for things which were wrong either in the matter or in the arrangement of Mark's work, by saying that he was dominated by a desire to pick up all the crumbs that fell from Peter's table. Now just in proportion as we find that the case for identifying Papias's first Gospel with Matthew breaks down or is weakened, so much the stronger becomes the suspicion (already aroused in the minds of many critics), that perhaps the writing which Papias attributed to Mark may vary in some essentials, both of matter and order, from that we call the canonical Gospel of Mark.

And further, since Irenæus in his discussion of the fourfold Gospel has misunderstood Papias in regard to the matter of a Gospel written in the Hebrew dialect by Matthew, and has led into the same error all the fathers of later days, we must allow that if Papias was misunderstood by Irenæus, then that father is, in one more instance, proved to be untrustworthy in regard to matters which he reports without sufficient criticism from the presbyters who had preceded him; and the fathers who range themselves behind Irenæus do not add anything to our knowledge, except under the psychological head of traditional credulity. So that one result of the new discovery will be to alter the balance of evidence in the early credentials of the four Gospels. If Matthew is to be carried far back into the first century we shall need a fresh analysis and readjustment of the evidence. We cannot say so dogmatically as Lightfoot does ("Essays on Supernatural Religion"), p. 172, of the theory of a Hebrew collection of Logia:

"It is encumbered with the most serious difficulties. In the first place, *there is no notice or trace elsewhere of any such 'collection of discourses.'* In the next place, all other early writers from Pantaenus and Irenæus onward, who allude to the subject, speak of St. Matthew as writing a Gospel, not a mere collection of sayings, in Hebrew."

The scorn involved in the expression "mere collection of sayings," would seem to be misplaced when we find the hypothesis of Logia antecedent to the four Gospels confirmed by the fragment which has been recovered, the value of which can hardly be overestimated.

Then, further, unless we are much mistaken, there will be a change of the critical attitude in matters relating to the text of the existing Gospels and the theories which are held with regard to the causes of the variations in those Gospels.

Up to the present time Resch has been preaching in the wilderness his theory of the influence of extra-canonical evangelic matter on the texts of the Gospels and the traditions of the fathers. His theory is that written traditions in the Hebrew language were early current in the Christian Church, and that traces of this Hebrew primitive Gospel are to be detected not only in the New Testament (St. Paul, St. James and the Apocalypse), but in Justin and Hermas and the Clementines, and a host of other places. We say that he has hitherto been preaching in the wilderness; he made the solitude for himself by encumbering his theory by a host of worthless variants, which were certainly due to no documentary source. But, unless we are mistaken, he will begin to preach on the house-tops. For example, let us take the seventh Logion in the fragment:

"Jesus saith, A city built on the top of a high hill and stablished can neither fall nor be hid." The reader will see that we have here a case of inverted parallelism, exactly like

{ "Give not that which is holy to the dogs,
 { Neither cast ye your pearls before swine;
 { Lest they trample them under their feet,
 { And turn again and rend you."

Here the two middle lines go together, and the two extremes, the dogs rending and the swine trampling according to their nature.

In the same way in the Logion we have an inverted parallel of two thoughts :

" A city built on a hill cannot be hid ;
A city stablished on a hill cannot fall."

The first half is Matt. 5 : 14 ; the second is closely related with Matt. 7 : 24, 25 ; and if we could suppose that in an Aramaic original the word for " rock " had been translated " hill " we should be in very close touch indeed with the thought that underlies Christ's saying about the house built on a rock which cannot fall.

Now in Matt. 5 : 14, the Greek Gospel has πόλις κειμένη, but all the Syriac texts of Matthew from Tatian and the Lewis text onward to the Cureton and Peshito versions read " a city builded." So that we must either say that this is the primitive reading, or we must say that a variant has come into the canonical text from an uncanonical text. This is Resch's theory ; and he had already indicated the variant in question as a case of the influence which he postulated as a cause of variation in the New Testament. It is instructive to compare what Resch says on this passage. He quotes (a) the Clementine Homilies iii. 67 : *χρημὲν οὖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὡς πόλιν ἐν ὕψει ᾧ κοδομημένην φιλόθεον ἔχειν τάξιν καὶ διοίκησιν καλὴν* (b) the text of the Arabic Tatian which only differs from the canonical text in having the words " built upon a mountain," instead of " set upon a mountain ;" (c) the canonical Matthew. He then remarks that a comparison of Tatian with the Clementines shows that the latter are really working up Matt. 5 : 14, while the variant betrays the fact of the influence of a pre-canonical form of the saying. Probably, says Resch, we should also carry back into the Hebrew text of the original logion the forms *ὑψος* and *ὄρος* which we find in the Clementines and in Matthew respectively, and regard them as translations of a single Hebrew word.

Now it is remarkable that not only has the suggest-

ed Greek variant φ' *κοδομημένη* turned up in the page of Logia ; but there is also a suspicion of the existence of the word *ὑψος*. For the logion as written by the scribe had the word *ὑψηλούς*, of which the σ was partially erased. Does it not look as if the word *ὑψους* had once stood there, and had been emended into [*ὄρους*] *ὑψηλ[ηλ]οῦς*.

Certainly we must admit that the recovered Logion stands on the side of Resch.

Moreover, the effect of this discovery will be felt in the discussion of the synoptic problem. It has been the fashion to regard the third synoptic as depending upon St. Matthew ; and even where this was not definitely held, he has been credited with editorial expansions and corrections of his own which do not come from the sources of the synoptic tradition. The critics have already caught at the word *δεκτός* which Luke uses of the prophet who finds no acceptance in his own country and which turns up in the text of our Logia. It cannot any longer be regarded as an editorial change made by Luke, although Matthew, Mark and John all express the idea of *ατιμία*. But if Luke has an independent tradition of his own to draw upon, we shall be able to claim originality for many things which only he records. Take, for instance, the woes which follow the blessings in the Sermon on the Mount. Resch points out acutely that is a wo and not a blessing which underlies the maxim of St. James that " he shall have judgment without mercy who showed no mercy ;" and he actually finds the missing half of the Logion in Ephrem Syrus in the form, " Blessed are they that have shown mercy, for there they will obtain mercy, and wo unto them that have not shown mercy, for they shall not obtain mercy." There is reason to believe that the measure of editorial skill with which Luke has been credited will have to be reduced.

Search must now be made in those writings which Resch credits with veins of logia in order that we may obtain the parallels which shall elucidate the obscurer sentences of the new collection. Perhaps even St. James may help us. What if the sentence " But ye

have despised the poor" in James 2 : 5, should be a logion ; in that case the single word *poverty* at the top of the *recto* page which the editors have deciphered might be the end of a sentence, "and ye have despised poverty." Such a sentence would, at all events, be in the manner and according to the mind of the Master.

ZIONISM.

BY EMIL REICH.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), August, 1897.

(*In two parts.*)

PART I.

IN a former number of this Review (September, 1896) the writer of the present article essayed to analyse, and appreciate at its historic purport, Antisemiticism, or the vast movement directed against the Jews in modern times.

Since that time many leading minds among the Jews have, in their attempts at meeting the attacks of their aggressors, conceived of and fairly started a counter-movement under the name of Zionism. It is here proposed to give first a short sketch of the labours of the Zionists ; and then to try to give a forecast of the results of that new movement on the basis of similar movements in the past and of the real character of Judaism in the present.

Zionism, it must be remarked, is a term admitting of more interpretations than one. There is, in the words of Jewish authorities, Zionism political, religious, and trading. The adherents of religious Zionism are in many ways bitter enemies of the partisans of political Zionism, and both look down with contempt upon the votaries of trading Zionism. Yet to the calm outsider, the political and the religious forms of Zionism have

much in common ; the difference being that the religious Zionist whispers *pianissimo*, where the political cries out *fortissimo* ; and that the former does not mean to say what he is doing, whereas the latter says what he does not seriously mean to do. The religious Zionists, or the "Lovers of Zion" as they style themselves, do not by any means intend to go back to the Holy Land in a body ; they do not want to precipitate the work of Him whom in their prayers they fervently beseech to bring them back to Palestine. They only want to send there individual members of Jewry, not many, yet several ; not shiploads of them, yet here and there a family or two ; perhaps six or a hundred and six. By so colonising the Holy Land, they gratify their craving for the return to Palestine, which it is their religious duty to maintain in some corner of their hearts, without giving unnecessary offence in public. The political Zionists, on the other hand, come before Europe with a proposal of a much bolder nature. Since the present social condition of Jews, they contend, is becoming more and more insufferable on account of the spread of Antisemitism, they call upon the Jews to leave Europe and to found a State of their own ; preferably in Palestine, but, if necessary, in Argentina, or anywhere else. At the head of religious Zionism are the numerous "Tents" of the "Lovers of Zion ;" their press-organ in England being *Palestina*, a quarterly. At the head of political Zionism is Dr. Theodor Herzl, journalist, of Vienna ; and, it would appear, the famous Nordau, author of *Paradoxes, Conventional Lies, Degeneration*, etc.

The activity of religious Zionists has so far been crowned with much success. Without any disturbance of extant relations, and without creating any undue sensation, they have to some extent realised the pious wish of the Rev. John Lamond, as expressed in his recent work urging a new Crusade. They have colonised Palestine, or rather parts of the Holy Land, by settling Jewish colonists at Richon-le-Simon, Ekron, Petah-Tekwah, Zammarin (on the slopes of Carmel), Castinie, and other places indicated on a large wall-

map drawn by Colonel Goldsmid, in which all the names of the Jewish colonies are indicated in red ink. Mr. Dickson, British Consul at Jerusalem, in his report of 1896, has described the condition of these agricultural and vinicultural colonies as more or less prosperous, at least relatively speaking ; and he also makes mention of a school of agriculture established for the Jewish colonists at Jaffa. In the quarterly *Palestina* much valuable information is published about the progress of these colonies in Palestine ; and their future, watched over with solicitude by the numerous "Tents" of the "Lovers of Zion," seems to be fairly assured. So great and serious is the desire of that class of Zionists to repeople Palestine with Jews, and thus to prepare the ultimate "reconquest" of the land of their fathers, that a special commission, if a self-elected one, has, under the guidance of Mr. H. Bentwich, been sent out to Palestine in April last, with a view of ascertaining the precise possibilities of colonisation in Palestine. Mr. Bentwich has come to very sanguine conclusions. He has little doubt as to the perfect feasibility of taking back Palestine by slow but continuous colonisation of the land at the hands of Jewish settlers. Mr. Zangwill, the well-known novelist, on the other hand, who has also formed part of that commission of pilgrims, has come to a conclusion quite different. He sees difficulties of an almost insurmountable character in any attempt at colonising Palestine on a larger scale. In this the great poet is not borne out by the opinions of Colonel Conder, Sir Charles Wilson, Professors Socin, Ridgeway, and Selah Merrill, who had been consulted by the religious Zionists before they started their undertaking some five years ago. Yet this much seems to be certain : the Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine do not pay as yet, and personal safety is at a discount. One of the religious Zionists, while recognising the danger threatening colonists from the vagrant Bedouins, yet hopes that "Jewish colonists galloping over the hills on wild chargers, or patrolling their fields with guns slung across their backs and cartridges round their waists," might strike a whole-

some terror into the savage sons of the Palestinian mountains. However that may be, the quiet and well organised work of the Zionists of the religious description all over the world is—aided by some of the millionaire Jews, especially the Rothschilds—proceeding steadily and regularly. In course of time they may succeed in covering a large area of the Holy Land by that process of infiltration, and thus steal a march on the Messiah whom they expect.

The work of the political Zionists has been up to this writing one of open propaganda for the establishment of a new Jewish State proper. Dr. Herzl, in a pamphlet published last year in several languages, boldly advances the idea that whereas the condition of the Jews in Christian countries is at present one of unbearable humiliation; and whereas Antisemitism, or the engine of that general hatred and persecution of the modern Jews, is triumphant to a degree, so that no plausible means of stemming its tide can be, nor has been, suggested: be it resolved, that the Jews of all countries, who after all are nothing but Jews, and have never, nor will they ever, really assimilate with the nations among whom they live—that the Jews, the doctor says, shall abandon the inhospitable fields of Europe, and, repairing to Palestine, there re-establish their ancient State. Nor is the great journalist at a loss as to the precise institutions, laws, constitution, etc., to be adopted by that new State. In chapters so admirably short as to shame the prolixity of Solon and the verbosity of Lycurgus, Dr. Herzl sketches the constitution and laws of the new State in details clear and pregnant. Everything has been provided for. The Jews of Europe have neither a common language nor common usages; neither many common religious ideas nor common social standards. They differ from one another in every possible respect. The Russian Jew and the French Jew, the Austrian Jew and the Spanish or Dutch Jew are opposed to one another in some of the most vital elements of life, social or political. Yet the doctor knows how to unite them; he knows how to weld them into one homogeneous com-

munity of citizens enthusiastic for one and the same grand ideal. He has no doubt about his scheme ; it is realisable ; it must, it will be realised. Or shall the Jews continue to listen patiently to the calumniations of the Antisemites ? The Antisemites are bad folk ; they invent lies ; they go about preaching, lecturing, haranguing in all countries and at all times. The worst is, they make headway. Or has not the first gentleman of Europe, the present Emperor-King of Austria-Hungary, finally confirmed the mayoralty of that Ahasverus, Dr. Lueger of Vienna ? Is not Antisemitism almost officially recognised in Germany, Russia, and France ? All the liberal laws of Europe passed from 1820 to 1870 in favour of the emancipation of the Jews, have they not been practically repealed ? And Jews shall continue to live in Europe ? Are they entirely oblivious of their great principle of *Do ut des* ? As long as Jews were left in peace and in good offices and posts—why, as long as that was the case, they might very well sing patriotic songs in finely polished German, or French. They got their money's worth for their patriotism. Heine might sing of his "German doublet" underneath which throbbed his "German" heart ; Lassalle might address in words burning with German patriotism the German workmen. At present, matters are quite changed. Instead of being left in peace, Jews are actually attacked. People, bad people presume to do by them what the Roman patricians did by the plebeians ; the *Bianchi* of Florence by the *Neri* ; the Tories by the Whigs ; the *Montagne* by the Girondists ; or the Catholics by the Protestants. It is an outrage. It is a sin. Has history ever recorded outrages and sins as dire and ghoulish as are the misdeeds of the modern Antisemites ? What are the Gracchian or Marian squabbles beside the speeches full of Antisemitic poison delivered by the Dantons and Marats of the Austrian journal *Vaterland* or the French journal *La Libre Parole* ? What is the *Terreur noire* or the *Terreur blanche* in the times of the French Revolution, beside the libels levelled at the modern Jews ? Or do not Turkish atrocities of misrule appear

tame and childish beside the hideous wrongs perpetrated on the Jews of Austria or Germany? No; it is evident Jews can no longer endure the shame of Antisemitism. They are a nation by themselves; one of the oldest nations; one of the most astounding nations. Why then stand what no nation that respects itself has ever stood? Why not *be* a nation? And why not coalesce, conglomerate, or coagulate, if you please, into a State of their own?

The doctor has removed even that formidable difficulty which to previous founders of States has always given the greatest trouble. Mahomet and his first successors waged immense wars in quest of land to be settled by Mussulmans. So did the Normans, the Teutonic knights, the *Conquistadores*, the English. Not so Dr. Herzl. In our civilised times the din of arms is too harsh and obsolete a means. Turkey, he alleges, will gladly part with Palestine for a substantial consideration. The finances of Turkey are in a shattered condition. If, now, the Jews offered to the Sultan an annual tribute, to start at £100,000, and guarantee a loan of £2,000,000, the tribute and further loans to increase in accordance with the increase of the population: the Sultan would, Dr. Herzl thinks, grant the Jews in return the right of settlement and the autonomous government of Palestine. Nor is that idea of a Jewish State in Palestine of merely local interest. For, says the doctor,

The greatest political movement of our times is the construction of a northern railroad to Asia. Asia at the present day is further from Europe than America. The Russian railway connection with Northern Asia is a somewhat stupendous undertaking. . . . Only the people of the coming century will be able to estimate the national migratory movements which will result from the formation of these means of communication, movements that will react in a thousand ways for good and evil upon the normal conditions of life in Europe. We are, indeed, face to face with a problem of unknown dimensions. But our simple understanding tells us this northern connection with Asia will necessitate the opening up of a southern line, and that the hitherto shortest routes of communication cannot suffice. A glance at the new map informs us that the new road will and must lead through Palestine. . . . A syndicate intends to apply for a concession to construct a railway from the Mediterranean Sea to the Persian Gulf. . . .

Dr. Herzl continues to say that Jews should apply for

that concession, and thereby immeasurably extend the mercantile openings of the new Jewish State.

In the course of the present year Dr. Herzl and Dr. Nordau have laboured to bring that great question of the Jewish State to some practical head. The most effective means of doing so was adopted : a Congress was convened, the members to meet at Munich. For reasons that have not been made known, Munich as a trysting place for Zionists was found to be inopportune ; and the Congress is now convened to meet at Bâle in this month of August, 1897. Six great issues form the " platform " of that Congress. First, the condition of the Jews in the several countries ; referee, Dr. Max Nordau, Paris. Secondly, colonisation in Palestine and its results ; referee, Mr. Willy Bambus, Berlin. Thirdly, objects of Jewish charity in Palestine ; referee, Dr. Hirsch Hildesheimer, Berlin. Fourthly, questions of finance ; referee, Dr. Max Bodenheimer, Cologne. Fifthly, the Jewish question and the proximate diplomatic Congress of the Powers ; referee, Dr. Theodor Herzl, Vienna. Sixthly, exhibition of Jewish colonial products at the Paris exhibition of 1900. One of the foremost questions suggesting itself is, in whose name, on behalf of whom, and who does convene the Congress? According to the latest news (14th of July), two of the above referees, Dr. Hirsch Hildesheimer and Mr. Willy Bambus, have withdrawn from the Congress ; so that practically Dr. Herzl and Dr. Nordau are the only prominent Zionists calling upon their fellow-Jews to come to Bâle. Yet there can be no doubt that Dr. Herzl's proposal has met with great sympathy in nearly all large centres of Judaism ; and the discussions and correspondence in reference to the new Jewish State have waxed to a prodigious mass. The Congress will be held ; and for the first time since the sixties of the seventeenth century the question of a wholesale return of Jews to Palestine will be seriously discussed before Christian Europe. That question interests not only Jews and Antisemites, but also the rest of Europe. An exodus of some five million people,

who for good or evil have grown to be no inconsiderable factor in the material and intellectual, if not also in the national life of Europe, must needs give rise to very grave problems of policy and economics. Let us now weigh the chances of that enterprise by the light both of the present and past attitude of the Jews; by the light of what Jews have thought of similar ventures in the past, and what, according to their very constitution as Jews, they are most likely to think of it in the near future.

The Jews, as is well known, have at all times after the destruction of their State by Titus and Hadrian, hoped for and religiously believed in their bodily return to Palestine, and in the restoration of the Jewish State. In numerous prayers of theirs that hope is given passionate expression, and some ultra-modern Jews have with logical severity proposed to have such prayers eliminated from the prayer books of all such Jews as claim to have completely amalgamated themselves with the Christian nation in the midst of which they live. Up to this hour, however, the prayers have not been cancelled; and the Jews of all descriptions still mark themselves out, by those very prayers, as mere denizens and sojourners in the countries whose citizens they are taken to be. It has been remarked by critical scholars and pious Christians alike, that the Old Testament does not preach a belief in a future world; or, still more correctly, that it does not dwell at all on the individual immortality of the believer's soul. I shall refer to that capital point lower down; here it is adduced merely to point out that to the Jew of the Diaspora, to the mediæval or modern Jew, the belief in the restoration of the ancient Jewish State has much of the religious nature of the Christian belief in a future world. To both the coming into the state of future blessedness is the cardinal point of their inner life. Both found their beliefs on facts of sublime, supramundane, and unanalysable character. In both therefore the belief is almost unshakable, ineradicable. It thus happened that whenever one of the numerous

pseudo-Messiahs appeared who, for reasons that generally escape us, contrived to be believed in by numerous Jews as being the Designated One—the Messiah—a religious mania was seen to seize the Jews of some and eventually of all countries, the like of which among Christians can be found only in the times of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, or similar crusading epochs. The most astounding of these religious frenzies happened in the seventh decade of the seventeenth century. A Jew of Smyrna, in Asia Minor, by the name of Sabbatai Zevi, who in addition to a winsome exterior had the reputation of being deeply versed in the mysteries of the Kabbala, was publicly declared to be the long-expected Messiah. The enthusiasm for Zevi, which had first spread among his personal friends only, rapidly extended over country after country, until the Jews of Holland, Germany, Denmark, Poland, as well as those of Italy, England, Hungary, and Russia, were thrown into the wildest excitement of hope and expectation. The sober and rich Jews of Amsterdam and Hamburg were indulging in frantic dances over the supposed coming of the Messiah. Jubilees were celebrated all over Europe; the few sceptical minds among the Jews were silenced with threats. Zevi was overwhelmed with presents and gifts of all kinds; he was credited with powers of healing diseases by the touch of his hand; Jewish pilgrims from all parts of Europe dogged his steps wherever he went; and that excitement having been increasing for many months, the Sultan finally began to feel uneasy, and Zevi was summoned to Constantinople. Before accompanying him there, let us pause for a moment to consider the Jewish communities who readily and ardently believed in that imbecile impostor. The Jews in Holland, mostly descendants of Spanish Jews, were not only very rich, but also in the enjoyment of full civil rights. They had great influence with Stadthouder and Grand Pensionnaire, no less than with the various Diets in Holland. Their houses were filled with great art-treasures; their schools were highly developed, and many among them had a considerable share of the then cur-

rent classical culture, reading Latin, even Greek, and talking French or Spanish, in addition to Dutch or German. It was from among them that men arose whose fame has not yet faded, while in one case it is likely never to decay : Morteira, Uriel Acosta, Spinoza. It was in the midst of Jewish communities as rich and cultivated as those of Amsterdam and the Hague that the religious enthusiasm for the Messiah ran wildest. "In Amsterdam," Dr. Graetz, the historian of the Jews, tells us—"in Amsterdam the devotion to the new faith expressed itself in contradictory ways, by noisy music and dancing in the houses of prayer, and by gloomy, monkish self-mortification. The printing presses could not supply enough copies of special prayer books in Hebrew, Portuguese, and Spanish for the multitude of believers. In these books penances and formulas were given by which men hoped to become partakers in the Kingdom of the Messiah." Henry Oldenburg, the secretary of the Royal Society in London, wrote to Spinoza (December, 1665) : "All the world here is talking of a rumour of the return of the Israelites, who have been dispersed for more than two thousand years, to their own country. Few believe it, but many wish it. . . . Should the news be confirmed it may bring about a catastrophe in all things." But as if to cap all previous or subsequent instances of religious gullibility, Sabbatai Zevi was believed in by untold masses of fanaticised Jews even after his formal conversion to Mahometanism, which, under threats from the Sultan, the wretched impostor did not hesitate to consent to. The Kabbalists and partisans of the new Messiah "easily got over objections." "Sabbatai," they explained, "had not turned Mahometan, but a phantom had played that part ; he himself had retired to heaven or to the Ten Tribes, and would soon appear again to accomplish the work of redemption." The impostor died, abandoned and forsaken, a few years later, at Dulcigno, in Albania, whither he had been sent by the Sultan.

From the study of the skein of absurd incidents and events connected with the appearance of Shabthai

Tsevi (as his real name appears to have been) one clear lesson can be drawn. However insipid and silly the whole melodramatic performance may have been, it was based on the fundamental religious belief of the Jews. It did not justify itself on the score of persecutions suffered at the hands of non-Jewish oppressors ; it did not, as does the proposal of the modern Zionists of Dr. Herzl's school, urge practical and political Zionism owing to pressure from outside. Dr. Herzl says : " We are oppressed, and all Christian nations say that we are *de trop*. Let us therefore abandon Christian countries, and repair to Palestine." The enthusiasts mustering round Shabthai did not say a word about the Christians. They simply followed the religious bent long nourished in every Jew. And in this fact alone there was a power infinitely superior to the propelling forces in the latest aspect of Zionism. If States are to be established, they must ; at any rate, they can be established on a fervent religious belief common to all the founders. It is doubtful whether any State has ever been founded without that broad basis which is composed of some great hope, some eternal belief, some supra-ephemeral creed, which is called Religion. Colonies, small colonies, as distinguished from States, may perhaps and for a short time be made to prosper without paying especial attention to religion. Of States the same can scarcely be said ; least of all, of the Jewish State. For Jewish State really means Jewish Religion. Had Shabthai not undone his own work by giving way to common fear, he might have accomplished much. Dr. Herzl will accomplish nothing ; and Dr. Nordau neither. Religion to the latter is a subject of mental physiology ; possibly, and probably, of mental pathology. As far as can be judged from his published works, Dr. Nordau has been studying social phenomena after the method called by the Germans " natural philosophy method" (*naturwissenschaftliche Methode*). This method will, we respectfully submit, lead to no real insight into the phenomena of social or religious history. At least it never has so far. The very proposal, backed by Nordau, testifies to an

utter lack of historic insight into social or religious phenomena. We could fully and easily comprehend an exodus of all the Jews to Palestine, if Dr. Herzl or Dr. Nordau were capable of arousing in the Jews one half of that religious enthusiasm which Shabthai and his managers succeeded in creating. Without such an enthusiasm; without instilling in the Jews a firm, an ardent belief that the time of the Messiah has come; without prevailing on them that Dr. Theodor Herzl, of Vienna, IXth district, Berggasse No. 6, or Dr. Max Nordau, of Paris, author of *Degeneration*, etc., is the real Messiah: the Jews, on their arrival in Palestine, will, to the great astonishment of the natural-philosophy method, abandon Zionism in a body, and be assimilated by the extant population of the Holy Land in the very fashion in which all German or Irish emigrants are assimilated by the Yankees. It does not take any extraordinary knowledge of history or religion to forecast that. All that is necessary is a cool and unprejudiced study of what really constitutes the Jew.

The Jew is distinguished from the Christian, but not by race or blood. The time has, it may be trusted, at last come when all the childish delusions about "races" among white humanity have been, or ought to be, abandoned. It is a species of delusion brought into the world by philologists, who do need such a fiction. Wherever they see difference in language, they at once conclude that there must be also difference in race. The language of the Jews belongs to the Semitic stock of languages; hence philologists persuade themselves, and alas! also other people, that there is a "Semitic race." There is none. There has never been any. The nations talking Semitic languages have at all times so profoundly differed from one another that nothing short of wilful blindness to facts can consider them as constituting one and the same stock of people with essentially the same qualities. The "Semitic" race will disappear, as has the "Doric" or "Pelagic" race, and as will the "Celtic" and "Saxon" race. In fact, among white men there are no permanent "races." They are all of the same kind; and

their vast differences in institutions and manners are owing to facts totally independent of "racial" differences. "Race" is a word; no more. It is not a reality, nor a force of nature. It has never troubled the tiniest water of history; although, like so many other words, it has been frequently used as a watchword and war-cry in the mightiest events of the past. This, however, does not alter the truth; history being generally acted in a language, in which A is said and B is meant. Yet, with all that, the Jew differs from the Christian, and radically too. He differs from the Christian much more than he ever differed from the heathen Greek or Roman. With the latter he had and still has some essential features in common. With the Christian he has the most essential feature not in common. The Greek and Roman of pre-Christian times was a citizen *par excellence*; the best part of his self was identified with his city-state. Of the solitary and self-sufficient man, post-Hellenic times have made an ideal: he is either a saint or a Robinson Crusoe. With the Greeks he was—a Cyclope. All the sentiments and most of the intellectual forces of free men were engaged in, or absorbed by, their several States. So was that of the Jew in historic times. He was a member of the Jewish State; individually, he counted for little. The basis of individual life was not the relation of one Jew to another Jew, whether as parent, child, or friend; nor of every single Jew to God; but of the community of Jews to God. The prophets seldom, if ever, speak of the relation of the individual to God. God might and did visit the misdeeds of His chosen people on the individual Jew; the private virtues of the latter did not avail him any. Like the Greeks, the ancient Jews praised most the κοινῶνικαὶ ἀρεταί, or the virtues arising from and through the community of men. The Jews as a nation were, as Isaiah says, the vineyard of God; they were, as Daniel puts it, the Son of God; and Jeremiah never dwells on the religious relation between the individual and God. Salvation to the individual Jew came chiefly through his very belonging to the community of the Jews. It was

not a reward or grace to be obtained by individual efforts of a religious or moral character ; it was a right to be practised in force of his citizenship. The *civis Romanus* claimed the protection of the Roman State anywhere and everywhere by virtue of his citizenship. So did the Jew claim God's special blessing by virtue of his Jewish citizenship. His basis was the broad community of his State ; his life was the life of that State. And feeling, as he did, the strongest roots of his individual existence sprouting from the roots of his State ; and being scarcely conscious, as he was, of life individual as against life communal, how could he particularly crave for an indefinite extension of that individual life beyond the gates of Death, since he valued it so little this side of them ? What sting could Death have to him whose life was mostly identified with an immortal State ? Nor did he have such craving. Sure of the present immortality, as it were, of his base—that is, his State—he did not cast the anchor of his existence in the sea of a future immortality, but in the eternal stream of actual life. In this too he resembled the Greeks and Romans who, for analogous reasons, did not trouble themselves very much about the world to come. In time therefore, as well as in all eternity, the pre-Christian Jew found all religious elevation, all religious solace and assurance, through his people, his nation. It was not this or that class of his people ; not the priests, as such ; not the kings ; not the prophets ; nor was it a certain book handed down, or a tradition living in his people ; it was the people itself. It was, as in theological terms we should style it, this people as the incarnation of God's will. Between the individual Jew and God stood, as mediator and as saviour, the people of Israel. Forgiveness and pardon, atonement and salvation, could come to the individual only through the forgiveness and salvation bestowed by God upon the people as a whole. This is the fundamental belief, the one ineradicable creed that made and makes the distinctive feature of Judaism. The Messiah, whose type the prophets and later seers were elaborating, did not touch on that basal conception of

the nation of the Jews being the mediator between the individual Jew and God. The Messiah is, at best, an agent of God, in the interest of the Jewish nation ; not of this or that Jew. He who believes in that mediator-ship of the Jewish nation is a Jew. He who does not believe in it is no Jew, and if all his ancestors were " Semites."

This, then, being the essential characteristic of Judaism, it is comparatively easy to see why Jews have never sympathised with Christianity. The Christians too—like all Monotheists—believe in a mediator, a saviour ; in Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus, however, is not the Messiah in the Jewish sense of the term. He is not a mere agent, a mere leader to salvation. He himself is salvation, and salvation to the individual man. He is to the individual Christian what the Jewish nation is to the Jew. To believe in him is, for the Jew, tantamount to treason to the Jewish nation ; and, at the same time, superfluous treason too. For, the very salvation that is offered in Jesus, the Jew has it, and has long had it, he firmly believes, in his nation. For this one reason the Jews, as a community, have never turned and will never turn Christians. Religious and patriotic passions alike prevent it. Even such among the modern Jews as have discarded all the ritualism of their forefathers, and never frequent a synagogue, are still cleaving to their nation by the fibre of a dumb and unreasoning patriotism ; and, in the words of Nordau, cling to Judaism and keep aloof from Christianity from " an insurmountable historic sentiment." Had the Fathers of the Church discarded from their Canon the books of the Old Testament, many more Jews might have been converted to Christianity. The Fathers, however, accepted the Old Testament as the basis of the New, as part of the Canon of the Christian Church, recognising its inspiration and holiness. What more did the Jews need to embrace their belief in Judaism with tenfold greater intensity ? Both Jew and Christian rest their dearest hopes in one surpassing Personality, mediating between them and God. The personality of the Jew is one particular Nation, clearly

differentiated from all other nations. The personality of the Christians is that of Jesus, the Saviour, than whom no individual has ever been endowed with richer elements of religious inspiration.

We thought it indispensable for a due appreciation of Zionism in general to go back to the first principles involved in the case. We shall now apply them to the actual aspect of Zionism as it has developed within the last year or two.

THE TWO FIG TREES: AN ADDRESS TO CHILDREN.

BY THE REV. HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), August, 1897.

I AM going to tell you about two fig trees; one which Jesus cursed, and the other which He blessed. You all know about the fig tree which He cursed. Our Lord's miracles were works of goodness and mercy. They were done to save and bless people. But there was one of them, at least, that was a work of destruction. One day Jesus went out of Jerusalem at sunset to spend the quiet evening hours at Bethany, a little village hid in a dimple of the Mount of Olives. Next morning as He was going back to the sacred city to resume His work of teaching the people—for He had but a short time now to do that work, and must therefore do it with all His might—He felt very hungry. Either He had started too early from the hospitable home of Martha and Mary to break His fast, or He was so occupied with the thought of the work that He was going to do, that He forgot all about His bodily wants, as, you remember, He forgot his thirst when He was speaking to the woman of Samaria at the Well of Jacob. In any case, He was very faint and hungry, and He looked about for something to eat, which it is not difficult to find in that fruitful and open-

handed country. He saw a fig tree by the wayside clothed with green glossy leaves, and He expected to find fruit on it ; for in the fig tree the fruit comes out before the leaves, and ripens slowly under the cool shelter of the shining foliage. But He was greatly disappointed, and in the revulsion of feeling said, ' Let no fruit grow on thee forever,' and presently the fig tree withered away. In the face of all Jesus' acts of love and kindness that knew no limit, it seems very strange that He should have used His power in this instance only to destroy. It shows us surely that Jesus is not all meekness and gentleness. There is such a thing as the wrath of the Lamb. Jesus is full of pity for sinners ; but against wilful, impenitent sin, He is terrible in His judgment, and we are commanded to ' kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and we perish from the way.'

You must not suppose that Jesus vented His disappointment and wrath against a senseless tree, as a dog worries the stone that has been thrown at it. No ; it was against what the barren fig tree represented that He was angry. That barren fig tree was a picture of the Jewish nation. God, the Husbandman of souls, had done everything for that tree. He chose it out from all other trees. He planted it on a very fruitful hill, in carefully prepared and enclosed soil. He digged about it, and dressed it ; He gave it every advantage ; and yet when He came in the fulness of time seeking fruit from it, it put Him off with the rustling leaves of profession only. God chose it and cultivated it that it might bear fruit to bless the world, and it kept all its goodness to itself ; it bore nothing but the selfish ostentatious leaves of pride and conceit. The Jewish nation had failed to fulfil the purpose of God in its election. God elected it that through it, and the special advantages which it got, all the families of the earth might be blessed. But it became Pharisaical and self-righteous and self-satisfied, and looked upon itself as the favourite nation of Heaven, and looked down upon all other people, and would have nothing to do with them. And therefore God cast them out

of His vineyard, and pronounced the sentence of doom upon their barrenness.

But if the withered fig tree is a picture of the self-righteous Pharisee who lives for himself only, whom Christ destroys by His curse, let me show you another tree which Christ blessed. This tree is called a sycamore in the Bible, but it is in reality a kind of fig tree. It is very common in the warmest parts of the Holy Land, and it puts out branches from its trunk so close to the ground that it is easy to climb up into it, and a very small man, or even a child, would have no difficulty in mounting and securing a safe seat among its boughs. I saw a good many sycamore trees growing near the ruins of Jericho. This tree bears a kind of fig, but not a fig of the best sort. The common people eat it, but it has an insipid taste, and I don't think you would be tempted to pluck many of those figs after having eaten one. It has a curious peculiarity about it. You require—while it is still on the tree—to scrape or cut off the top of it to make it eatable; for if you neglect to do this before it is ripe, it becomes nauseous and corrupt. Amos, the prophet, you remember, was a gatherer or a cutter of sycamore figs; and as he worked away, cutting his figs, trying to make the fruit better, he had earnest thoughts about his own people and how to improve them also.

Well, this inferior kind of fig tree bore, on one occasion, a very extraordinary fruit on its branches. Strange to say it was a man, Zaccheus by name. He was a tax-gatherer whom every one hated and despised, because he was a renegade Jew who took the side of the conquering Romans against his own nation, and grew rich by oppressing his people with heavy taxes. He had heard of Jesus, and he was anxious to see Him. But being a little man, and a great crowd being in the place, he climbed up into this fig tree to get a better view of what was going on. He was like a wandering bird hitherto seeking a nest but finding none, and alighting on this bough if haply he might be successful this time. The sycamore figs were around him, growing in their strange way—directly out of the

trunk of the tree, and he was like one of them. He was a mean kind of fruit which everybody but the lowest disliked ; and like the sycamore fig, he needed to be subjected to a certain process of cutting and training to make him palatable and useful. The procession draws near, and the keen eye of Jesus sees the strange fruit up in the sycamore tree by the wayside, waiting for our Lord to make it fit for use in the world, by acting the part of Amos toward it. Nothing could have been simpler and more commonplace than the words which Jesus addressed to him. Jesus merely said that He was going home with him, to stay all night at his house. It was an ordinary greeting which one man might make to another. But the words meant much to Zaccheus. For, just think of what he was. His own neighbours treated him as a social leper or outcast. They would have nothing to do with him ; all his wealth would not bribe them to enter his house, or exchange a civil word with him if they met him in the fields. They shut him up by their scorn and hatred into an awful loneliness. To use a modern word with an evil meaning, they boycotted him in all the relations of life ; and what that meant, no one who believes how dependent we are upon our friends and neighbours for our comfort and happiness can be ignorant of.

How precious, then, to such a man would be the offer which Christ made to go home with him, self-invited ; for Zaccheus would not have dared to ask Jesus to partake of his hospitality. How sweet the words of unwonted kindness that greeted him, must have sounded in his ears ! They must have fallen like dew upon his parched soul, longing for human sympathy and fellowship. That he, whom every one despised and hated, should be the only one out of all the vast crowd to be thus distinguished by the great Prophet, was almost incredible, and it filled his soul with a humble joy.

But there was more than this in the words of Jesus. There was wonderful consideration in them for the feelings of one in the position of Zaccheus. No words

of reproach did the Saviour utter. He did not upbraid the tax-gatherer for his unpatriotic conduct, and for his manifold cruelties and extortions in his hateful office. He who lashed the sins of the Pharisees with words of withering scorn and indignation, had not a single word of condemnation to utter against this publican, whom the Pharisees looked upon as the vilest sinner of all. It was this gracious treatment that melted the heart of Zaccheus and conquered his soul with a single stroke. Trusted by Christ, he would strive in future to become worthy of that trust. Treated with kindness by Christ, he would treat others with kindness. He would make all the atonement in his power for his past sins. He would give back four times more than he took from those whom he had unjustly taxed. And if he could not altogether or at once abandon his hated employment, he would only retain it for the sake of insuring to his countrymen more just and humane treatment at his hands than they would receive from any other tax-gatherer that might be appointed in his room. He would so use the powers and opportunities of his office, that he would make himself, if not loved, at least respected, and cause the hatred and contempt that his people cherished toward him to disappear.

That was the kind of fruit that Jesus gathered from the inferior fig tree at Jericho. Zaccheus was a sycamore fig, as it were, which the gracious dealing of Jesus had made sweet and eatable. In the neighbourhood of the Holy City of Jerusalem, He sought fruit from the highest kind of fig tree, and He found none. He met only with Pharisaic pride and pretension, which had no real food for the cravings of humanity, no blessing for the weary, sinful world. But here, down among the dark defiles of the old wicked Jericho, with all its dark associations, not far from where Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for their iniquity, He found the finest fruit from the most degraded fig tree, from the most degenerate of the sons of Abraham, one who was worse than useless, one who oppressed his fellow-countrymen. And how that fair

fruit must have cheered the hungry soul of Christ ! How it must have been meat and drink to Him, as He toiled up the long and steep defile, to find at the top of it the cross of anguish and shame !

Jesus is come seeking fruit from you to-day. Which picture represents you—the barren fig tree on the heights beside the Holy City, with every privilege and blessing to make you fruitful, and yet continuing unfruitful—the barren fig tree which Jesus cursed and withered ; or the sycamore tree with its living fruit on it, down in the low depths of Jericho, the depths of sin and shame—the fruitful fig tree which Jesus blessed ? Jesus is hungry for your salvation ; will you give Him nothing but leaves, mere professions, or good resolutions, or hopes, or promises that when you are older, and have had your fill of the pleasures of the world, and your leaf of life has become sear and yellow, you will produce the fruit of righteousness which He wants ? Or will you now climb the Gospel tree, that wisdom, which is a tree of life to them that lay hold of her, to see Jesus of Nazareth passing by, anxious to know Him and to serve Him, feeling that He is the very Saviour that you need ; to put yourself in the way of His saying to you, ‘ To-day I must abide at thy house ’ ? Are you making use of the sanctuary worship and of every sermon you hear as a tree to climb into, and enable you to see more of Jesus, that you may love Him more and serve Him better ? If so, then Jesus will come into your heart, to make the tree good from the very centre of its life, in order that the fruit may be good and abundant. And He will say to you, ‘ I have chosen you and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain.’

SUNDAY LAWS GOOD AND BAD.

BY REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist* (Boston), August 5, 1897.

IN answer to inquiries with regard to the new Sunday law in Connecticut and its probable operation, it may be said that with only slight changes it is a re-enactment of the law which has long lain quiescent upon the statute-book, and the new law may already be regarded as practically obsolescent. The "good people" of the State generally, so far as I am informed, had little to do with its enactment by the last legislature, and there was little discussion of the question. For the first time two weeks ago, when the law went into operation, the people of the State were awakened by the newspapers to the fact that a new Sunday law had been enacted. The law as it now stands is as follows :

Every person who shall do any secular business or labor, except works of necessity or mercy, or keep open any shop, warehouse or manufacturing establishment, or expose any property for sale, or engage in any sport between twelve o'clock Saturday night and twelve o'clock Sunday night, shall be fined not more than fifty dollars.

This new law follows exactly the phraseology of the old Sunday law except in these particulars—the words "or recreation," which occur after the word "sport" in the old law, are omitted in the new ; the time is extended in the new law from midnight to midnight, instead of to six o'clock Sunday night ; and the maximum fine is raised from four dollars to fifty. The significance lies in the fact that an old law is resuscitated rather than in any radical change in the character of the legislations. But was it wise to attempt to revive an old law by persuading a legislature to re-enact it ?

This attempted reinstatement of the Sunday law by a legislative act seems unwise and doomed to failure for

two reasons. First, the mere passage of the act does not secure its enforcement and, secondly, the re-enactment substantially of an obsolete law evades the whole question as to what under existing conditions a reasonable and practicable Sunday law ought to be. It would have been better to leave the law alone until the legislature is prepared to enact a new Sunday law which shall command general consent and be so wisely adapted to existing conditions of life that it can be reasonably enforced. I doubt very much the good effect in the long run of making the statute-book an exhibition of moral laws, hung up for ornamental purposes only. The general understanding, which has already been reached, that the prosecuting officers are to enforce this Sunday law only when they are obliged to do so by complaints which may be brought to them, and that except in cases of disorderly Sunday desecration complaints will not be brought, certainly does not serve to increase the popular respect for Connecticut law.

It may be said that the re-enacted law will prove a sharper tool in the hands of prosecuting officers in cases where an exasperated neighborhood are driven by excursionists or disorderly people to protect their own Sabbath quietness and rest, and, doubtless, the new law may be used to render Sunday evening more free in some places from questionable or positively harmful performances, but any attempt to enforce the law exactly as it reads would work confusion in the habits of all classes of the community, including many devout church goers. The only remedy would be to obtain from the courts a definition of the words "necessity and mercy" broad enough to cover whatever respectable people generally deem necessary to their Sunday digestion and good temper. The courts might be equal to this emergency, as in the exercise of common sense judges often show much facility in getting around difficult points of the law. But is it good public policy to put upon the statute-books of a State impracticable moral legislation in the expectation that either by its general non-enforcement, or by the

liberalizing interpretation of the courts, it will be made of none effect?

With regard to the most minute and complete system of prohibitory law which has been known in history, an apostle once wrote: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak." There are some things which the law may do for public morals, and there are some things which the law cannot do. If we would have a law do all that it can, it is wise to be careful not to make it attempt what law cannot do for the public morals. Our new law is in this respect no improvement upon the old. Little or nothing, therefore, is to be expected from it.

What, then, should be the principles of modern Sunday legislation? Upon what lines should a new Sunday law be drawn? I will offer these suggestions. Sunday legislation may justly restrain business competition and demands upon labor for the purpose of securing equal rights to a day of rest for all classes of people. Sunday laws, reasonably constructed on this principle, are securities of personal liberty. They protect the many for one day in seven from ruinous competition by the few. Our Sunday liquor laws, for example, are to be justified on this principle, apart from any interest of temperance. Without them no saloon keeper, who desires a day of rest like other people, could keep his bar closed on the Sabbath, and not be driven out of the business by more greedy competitors who would sell drinks every hour of the week in which anything might be made by keeping open. An equal right of all classes to the day of rest, so far as such right can be maintained under the necessities of civilization—this is a sound principle of Sunday legislation. Whoever would despoil any class of such right violates a liberty essential not only to the physical well-being but also to the claims of the home and the home-life of the people. Much needs to be said, also, from the moral point of view concerning the selfishness of well-to-do people who require unnecessary labor from others on the Sabbath merely for their personal convenience, and from no real necessity.

Again, Sunday legislation may be justly carried far enough to protect any one class or any particular locality from a violation of the quietness and orderliness of the day of rest. Unnecessary noises of all sorts, from the blowing of whistles, clanging of brass bands and ringing too vigorously, at least, of harsh church bells might fall within the possible scope of a good Sunday law. The police regulations of some German cities, which prohibit the marching of processions with bands or even the passing of heavily loaded wagons within certain prescribed limits of churches during their regular hours of service is a legitimate attempt to protect the interests of the whole community in the Sabbath day.

Sunday legislation, on the other hand, becomes questionable and is of doubtful effect in proportion as it aims by positive force of law to secure moral and religious results. The State may protect all classes in the legal right and liberty of a day of Sabbath rest; the State may within certain reasonable limits exercise police control over the personal liberty of some for the benefit of all; but, however the field may be policed, the church must sow the seed, and it is not the prime object of legislation to produce a moral harvest. The Connecticut Sunday laws, as re-enacted by the last legislature, seem to me to be bad legislation, first, because the people do not expect the prosecuting officers to enforce it, and, secondly, because if the attempt were made to enforce it literally and in all directions the people would clamor to have the courts liberalize the law by an artificial interpretation of the saving clause, "Except works of necessity and mercy." A good Sunday law should say what it means, and mean no more than the fair common sense of the people will maintain.

This new law may possibly serve three good purposes—it may be used more efficiently in some places to suppress violations of the Sabbath which are against the public sentiment and welfare in particular localities; it may also be used to prevent unscrupulous competition in some kinds of business where, without some

protection of law, a few might take advantage of the many in the sale of merchandise or the employment of labor ; and it may serve to excite a general discussion of the proper function and service of law with relation to the Sabbath day, and possibly some consequent legislation two years hence.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLET, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA AND ITS BAPTISMS OF FIRE : Being an Account of the Progress of Religion in America in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, as Seen in the Great Revivals in the Christian Church, and in the Growth and Work of Various Religious Bodies. By Rev. S. B. HALLIDAY, formerly Assistant Pastor of Plymouth Church with Henry Ward Beecher, and Rev. D. S. GREGORY, D.D., LL.D. New York : Funk & Wagnalls Co. 8vo, pp. xx. + 754. No index.

It is not just to condemn a pretty good book for not being the book that we wanted and might have hoped for under the title. A real history of American religious revivals, the fruit of faithful reading and study and of sympathetic but just criticism, is much needed. If not written for edification, it would be found highly edifying. The study of the faults and failures, as well as of the triumphs, of such evangelists as Whitefield and Tennent, as Nettleton and Burchard and Finney and Jacob Knapp, might be made, to theological students, what the study of great campaigns is to cadets at West Point. The present volume shows few signs of either study or thought. It gives the story of "The Great Awakening" chiefly from Joseph Tracy's work with that title ; and the story of "The Second Awakening," at the opening of the present century, from Dr.

Bennet Tyler's little volume. By far the most extraordinary and interesting part of the history of American revivals, the story of the amazing work in Kentucky and Tennessee in 1800-02, is not so much as referred to. Of more recent revivals, coming within the range of Mr. Halliday's observation and memory, we have some interesting details. The latter half of the book is taken up with accounts of a dozen of the leading sects of the American church, each written by a representative man of the sect.

A book of such slight literary pretensions it would be unreasonable to arraign severely at the bar of literary criticism. Otherwise we might point to some startling *errata*. It suffices to commend it for just what it is.

Leonard Woolsey Bacon.

BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTES.

BEFORE us are four books belonging to various branches of the field of Church History. The first is a volume in the series composing the International Theological Library, and treats of the *History of Christian Doctrine*. The author is Dr. George P. Fisher, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. The field which is covered is broader than that which is ordinarily included in works of this sort, and the reception which has already been accorded to it is the more hearty on this very account. Instead of delineating the history of dogma in the sense of authoritatively formulated statements of belief, Dr. Fisher has devoted himself to a history of Christian doctrine which includes more than the technical "dogma" of theological phrase. The work is divided into three parts, ancient, mediæval, and modern, and the growth of doctrine is included under five periods, the titles of which must be quoted in order to give an adequate notion of the whole: I. The rise and early types of theology to the complete system of Origen and to the fully established conception of the premundane personal Logos (about 300 A.D.); II. The development of Patristic theology in the East and in the West; III.

The development of Roman Catholic theology in the Middle Ages, and its reduction to a systematic form ; IV. The principal types of Protestant theology—the Age of Polemics—the crystallizing of parties and creeds ; V. Theology as affected by modern philosophy and scientific researches. The volume contains a total of about six hundred pages, but this is a rather narrow limit within which to compress so much of detail. The result has been that some of the things which one might desire to find have been omitted. The first necessity of the case was to present the more external facts in the case, and having done this the author had to rest content. He says "The special design of this volume and the limitations of space have compelled the exclusion of a larger amount of critical comment than its pages contain. The primary aim has been to present in an objective way and in an impartial spirit the course of theological thought respecting the religion of the Gospel." The author acknowledges his indebtedness to various writers, and the foot-notes indicate some of them, while at the same time furnishing the reader with helps to the sources. In spite of the comparatively narrow limits of the volume, it is the best book which we have in English dealing with the subject. The general reader will approve of the extension of the scope of the volume to include recent developments, and the lack of extended critical remark will the better adapt it to use as a text-book, because it will leave freer scope to the teacher, who will be able to supply this portion of the discussion according to his personal convictions. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50 net.)

The second volume is in the Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, which has already given us Bennett's *Christian Archæology*, Terry's *Biblical Hermeneutics*, Miley's *Systematic Theology*, and an augmented translation of Hagenbach's *Theological Encyclopædia*. The present volume is by the surviving editor of the series, Bishop John F. Hurst, and it is the first of two dealing with the *History of the Chris-*

tian Church. Here, again, the author has felt the restraining influence of space-limits, though it has taken almost a thousand pages to delineate the history of the Church to the close of the Middle Ages. But the author's aim was not to produce an exhaustive book, but one which should fit in the framework of the series. It is rather the handbook for students' use, and as such it will suffice to give a good idea of the subject, being midway between the brief outlines and the extended histories. The method pursued has been mainly that by topics, a method which in some respects is exceedingly convenient, making the volume particularly handy as a book of reference. One misses the index, but this will probably be contained in full in the second volume. Two features are worthy of special notice: the bibliographies and the maps. Of the former there are several, all arranged under the special topics which make up the volume. Special pains have been devoted to this feature, and some of the book-lists will be found to be almost exhaustive. The maps are six in number, and were made specially for this work by Mr. Alan C. Reiley, who is already well and favorably known through his work of similar character in other historical treatises. Of particular interest is the "development map of Christianity," showing by the aid of colors the growth of the Church before the beginning of the seventh century and its extension by periods to the close of the thirteenth century. (New York: Eaton & Mains. \$5.00.)

The third volume to be mentioned is much more restricted in scope, being an *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, by Henry O. Wakeman, tutor at Keble College, Oxford, and author of a volume on "The Church and the Puritans." The volume covers the whole period of English ecclesiastical history and comes down to the present time. It is written with the purpose of interesting the general reader as well as the special student, and its general style and method adapt it peculiarly to this end. The pages are not overburdened with the *disjecta membra* of the history,

but the author has undertaken to articulate those special and connected facts and events which make up the framework of the story of the development of the English Church. In a word, the author has attempted to answer the question, "How is it that the Church of England has come to be what she is?" Hence only the essential and significant facts are given, some periods being passed over in silence because of their comparative unimportance from this practical point of view. To aid the reader the author has prefixed a chronological table of eleven pages, giving the principal events and their dates. Indented marginal notes indicate the subjects treated in the text, and a copious index furnishes a valuable guide to the minutest contents of the volume. In about five hundred pages the author has given a very valuable *résumé* of the history of English Christianity, and he has made it possible for the reader to undertake more extended and detailed studies, with a good preliminary knowledge of the subject. (New York : Macmillan Co.)

Those who wish to gather the cream of ancient Church History have an excellent opportunity offered in a fourth volume, comprising *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*. The series was delivered in the Norwich Cathedral, and is introduced by a preface written by the Dean of Norwich. Barring a slight irregularity in the chronological order, the book is a model. The subjects treated are grouped under the names of Individuals : Ignatius, Polycarp, Aristides, Justin, Irenæus, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and the Church in the Catacombs. This is a complete list. The Cathedral authorities drew upon the best talent of England, and evidence of this is given by the appearance of such names as those of Dean Farrar, Professor Robinson of Cambridge, Dr. Leathes of London, Rev. A. E. Brooke, Professor Gwatkin of Cambridge, Professor Ince of Oxford, and Dr. H. G. C. Moule. The book is a fine one, inside and out, and is a valuable addition to the popular lit-

erature of Church History. (New York : Thomas Whittaker. \$2.25.)

In some ways the German publishers are more generous with the public than are their American or English *confrères*. A case in point is a recent volume on the *Urtext und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*. The volume is a compendious presentation of the subject, taken from the third edition of the "Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche," edited by Professor Albert Hauck, the second edition having been that of Herzog and Plitt. The unusual thing about the publication is that it forms an integral part of the series, and ordinarily it might be supposed that such publication as this would hurt the sale of the larger work. The Germans have long made a practice of printing separately the papers read before learned societies, but this is something rather new. The text is rather difficult to read, being set "solid," but the type is, of good size, and the amount of information given is very great. The writers are all well known, and they are all specialists in their lines. Professor Buhl of Leipzig writes on the text of the Old Testament, basing his paper on the article of Professor Dillmann ; Professor Gebhardt of Leipzig treats the New Testament text, succeeding Tischendorf. The treatment of translations has been given to a number of men who have made them special subjects of investigation, and, as might be expected, their combined labors have made an exceedingly valuable work. (Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs. 3 marks. Pp. 240, 8vo.)

It is a matter of congratulation to Presbyterians that at last an American edition of Dr. Alexander F. Mitchell's standard work on *The Westminster Assembly: its History and Standards*, has appeared. The volume originally constituted the Baird Lectures for 1882, and it has been for some time out of print. The approaching celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Westminster symbols undoubtedly has given the impulse to this

edition ; but whatever the present moving cause, the appearance of the volume is worthy of hearty reception. The growth of myths in connection with the subject is strange, and it is good to have the authentic story told by a master of the subject. There is no one in Great Britain better qualified for his task than is Professor Mitchell, and with this volume in hand the interest and appreciation of the anniversary celebration cannot but be more vivid and true on the part of all those whose religious life is connected in any degree with these venerable and venerated standards. (Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication.)

It is a rare opportunity that is given to the students of Yale University. A recent volume shows its extent and character. It is called *The Culture of Christian Manhood*, and it contains sixteen sermons preached in the college chapel by as many eminent divines. Now that they have been printed, they are brought within the reach of all, barring only the absence of the preacher's personality, which is an element of no small importance. The first of the series was by Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, now President of Union Seminary, and dealt with "Selected Lives." The following sermons called for the services of Congregationalists, such as Dr. McKenzie of Cambridge, Dr. Bradford of Montclair, Dr. Gordon of Boston, Professor Harris of Andover Seminary, Mr. Twichell of Hartford, and others ; of Presbyterians, Dr. Richards of Plainfield, Dr. Van Dyke of New York, Dr. Hamlin of Washington, Dr. McClure of Lake Forest, Dr. Stryker of Hamilton College, and Dr. Purves of Princeton Seminary. Bishop Vincent represented the Methodists, and Dr. Burrell the Reformed Church. A feature of special interest is found in the series of engravings representing the faces of the speakers. Altogether the volume is one of interest as well as of profit. (New York and Chicago : Revell Co. \$1.50.)

The fact that Rev. Arthur Wentworth Eaton's book, entitled *The Heart of the Creeds*, has gone to its third

edition makes it superfluous to subject it to extended criticism. The author's purpose may be stated in his own words. It was to portray historical religion in the light of modern thought—that is, to put before people the rational theology of the early Church and of the best thinkers of our own time, and in so doing set forth the undisputed religious principles which make the basis of the creeds and institutions of historical Christianity. The subjects treated are: God, Man, Christ, The Creeds, The Bible, The Church, The Sacraments, The Liturgy, and The Future Life. The author is an Episcopalian, and his book contains some things which will not be accepted by members of other denominations, but they are stated in a way to give little offence, but rather are calculated to reduce dissenting opposition to the terms of lowest irritation. (New York: Thomas Whittaker. \$1.00.)

The Rev. Alexander H. Cranford has added a supplementary volume to his "*Enigmas of the Spiritual Life*," which he calls *Christian Instincts and Modern Doubt*. His purpose is further defined on the title-page in a sub-title which calls the papers composing the volume "*Essays and Addresses in Aid of a Reasonable, Satisfying, and Consolatory Religion*." The papers are as follows: Some Advice to Agnostics; St. Paul in the third Heaven; a glimpse of the religion of the future; "Watchman, what of the night?"; The unwisdom of Secularism; and The present state of religious thought in Great Britain. The last paper is the longest and in some ways the most valuable. The author's standpoint is one which will be unacceptable to many, and yet one with which multitudes are in accord: "that of absolutely free but distinctively Christian thought. I have cast aside conventionalism, but I trust that I have not cast aside real and deep reverence for the fundamental ideas of the great Founder of our religion." (New York: Thomas Whittaker. \$1.50.)

A neat volume of sermons by Rev. Minot J. Savage, D.D., comprising some of his discourses during the present year, has come to hand, bearing the title *Relig-*

ion for To-day. They are dedicated as the firstfruits of his work in New York, to the Church of the Messiah, to the congregation to which they were delivered. There are fourteen sermons in the collection, and some of them have striking subjects: Present religious conditions; Is religion dying?; What is Christianity?; God inside the universe, not outside; The Church of yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow. While we cannot be expected to agree with the sentiments of the author in all points, we can express agreement at some, and can state an admiration for the forcible and straightforward expression of strong conviction. As a model in this respect the volume is valuable, and many of its positions are worthy of strong commendation. (Boston: George H. Ellis. \$1.00.)

The latest book of Dr. Arthur T. Pierson is an answer to the question, *Shall We Continue in Sin?* The sub-title indicates the fact that this is "a vital question for believers answered in the Word of God," and that the volume contains the substance of addresses delivered in Great Britain and Ireland in 1896. The author discusses the question of the title on the basis of Romans vi., vii., and viii., and he disclaims any thought of presenting a doctrine of sinlessness, but of "not continuing in sin." The thesis of the book is "that the disciple's security for non-continuance in sinning is found in his union with the Lord Jesus Christ," and this union is discussed under the phases indicated by the words judicial, vital, practical, actual, marital, spiritual and eternal. A special chapter is devoted to each of these discussions. (New York: Baker & Taylor Co. 75 cents.)

Murdered Millions is not a pleasing title, but it serves to draw attention to the urgency of medical missions. The author, George D. Dowkontt, M.D., is connected with the International Medical Missionary Society, with headquarters in New York, and he has put forth this little book in order to draw attention to a field in which much most profitable and benevolent work may be expended. The pictures which he draws are some-

times gruesome, but they serve to emphasize the awful and terrible needs which are known to missionaries. (The Medical Missionary Record, 121 East Forty-fifth Street, New York City. 15 cents.)

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
Am. J. T.	American Journal of Theology.	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South. (Quarterly.)
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Chr. Q.	Christian Quarterly.	Preb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Preb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex.	Expositor.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Episc. Review.
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Ref. C. R.	Reformed Church Review. (Quarterly.)
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the August number of periodicals.

- American Christianity.** (L. W. Bacon) Chr. L.
Andacolla, Miracle-working virgin of. (E. A. Lowe) Miss. H.
Anniversaries, Keeping of. (W. M. Sinclair) Hom. R.
Baraga, Bishop, Episcopate of. (R. R. Elliott) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Bradley's (Dr. F. H.) appearance and reality. (St. G. Mivart) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Burke's (Edmund) centenary. Some reflections on. (J. J. O'Shea) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Canada, New administration in. (E. Porritt) Yale R.
Canadians, Evangelization of the French. Miss. H.
Cathedrals and the cathedral system in the light of church history. (T. Duncan) Prot. Ep. R.
Christ in the twentieth century. (J. I. Buell) Meth. R.
Christian Endeavor in India. (F. E. Clark) Miss. H.
Christian experience, Secret of. (W. R. Nicoll) Chr. L.
Cooper Union, New York. Treas.
Creation story—its origin. (J. F. McCurdy) Hom. R.
Creed of the Mount. (D. J. Burrell) Pre. M.
Criticism, Tübingen school of. (E. N. Dewart) Hom. R.
Cyprian and the Holy See. (W. Barry) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Doubt, Function of. (J. H. Willey) Meth. R.
Economic and social legislation, Recent. (F. J. Stimson) Yale R.
Education, Catholic secondary, in the United States. (J. T. Murphy) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS. 411

- Elliot, George**—a sketch. (J. B. Kenyon) Meth.R.
Emery, Jacques André. (S. L. Emery) Am.Cath.Q.R. (July).
English ramble, Notes of an. (F. M. North) Meth.R.
Faith, Future of. (W. E. Barton) Treas.
Famine in India, Prevention and relief of. (P. C. Lyon) YaleR.
Germany, Protestant mission societies of. (G. H. Schodde) Miss.H.
God, Longing of the soul for. (E. D. Warfield) Chr.L.
Gospel and the Greek mysteries. (A. S. Carman) Bib.W.
Grace. (J. Wells) Ex.T.
Heathenism in India, Focus of. (H. G. Guinness) Miss.H.
Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life. (H. M. Thompson) Prot.
 Ep.R.
Hommel's "Ancient Hebrew Tradition." (D. S. Margolionth) Ex.T.
Hort's "The Christian Ecclesia," Notes from. (W. E. Chadwick)
 Chr.L.
Illustrations, Homely. (J. J. Pool) Pre.M.
Infant salvation, Development of the doctrine of. (B. B. Warfield)
 Chr.L.
International Missionary Union, Fourteenth annual meeting of the.
 (W. A. Farnsworth) Miss.H.
Italian navvies, Work among. Miss.H.
Italy, Evangelical church of. (A. Robinson) Miss.H.
Italy, Should, be evangelized? (Professor Rodio) Miss.H.
Japan, Two weeks' missionary trip in. (J. H. DeForest) Miss.H.
Jesus the Messiah, Wisdom of. (C. A. Briggs) Ex.T.
Lambeth conference and the historic episcopate. (V. Bartlett) Chr.L.
Men's societies. (B. F. Fritz) Treas.
Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy, Planting of the. (S. M. Ver-
 non) Meth.R.
Methodists, Should, "sing low"? (J. Lee) Meth.R.
Missions, Foreign, in the light of modern thought. (C. C. Tiffany)
 Prot.Ep.R.
Money, Plenty of, for things we like. (W. G. Puddefoot) Treas.
"New woman," Old faith and. (G. Tyrrell) Am.Cath.Q.R. (July).
Nobody—somebody—everybody. (M. G. Pearse) Pre.M.
Non-church going masses, How the, are to be reached. (T. D.
 Witherspoon) Hom.R.
Old Testament study, Most urgent need in. (W. J. Beecher) Bib.W.
Oxford movement, New, in England. (J. Kendal) Am.Cath.Q.R.
 (July).
Passover, God's. (J. McNeill) Treas.
Pastoral experience. (E. N. Packard) Chr.L.
Paul and Jesus. (A. Hoyle) Ex.T.
Paul's secret. (F. B. Meyer) Pre.M.
Piety, Personal, in hot weather. Chr.L.
Pigmies or dwarfs of Africa. (J. Gillespie) Miss.H.
Preaching, Personal factor in. (J. S. Kennard) Hom.R.
Preaching, Primary impression of. (T. W. Hunt) Meth.R.
Public expenditure in Europe. (G. Fiamingo) YaleR.
Pulpit and liberty. (W. S. Lilly) Hom.R.
Religious thought in England between Puritan and Methodist.
 (W. C. Madison) Meth.R.
Revelation: an exposition (W. Rauschenbusch) Bib.W.

- Scandinavian alliance mission of America.** (R. A. Jernberg) Miss. H.
Shakespeare, William. (T. W. Hunt) Treas.
"Sociétés de Secours Mutuels" of France. (W. F. Willoughby) Yale R.
Spain, Catholic—its politics and liberalism. (T. Hughes) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Spirit, Biography of. (G. M. Hammell) Meth. R.
Spirituality, Perils of. Chr. L.
Sponsorial obligation. (H. Thomas) Prot. Ep. R.
Stewardship, Study in. (C. H. Moscrip) Chr. L.
Stoicheolatry. (W. Kean) Ex. T.
Theology, The new, the fulfilling of the old. (G. W. Knox) Treas.
Tübingen school of criticism. (E. N. Dewart) Hom. R.
Turkish struggle with Catholic Europe. (B. J. Clinch) Am. Cath. Q. R. (July).
Two fig trees. (H. Macmillan) Ex. T.
Vendetta. (I. F. Russell) Meth. R.
Waldensian Missions in Italy. (G. C. Mangeri) Miss. H.
Young people, Christian, Organizations of. (A. T. Pierson) Miss. H.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

American Catholic Quarterly Review.

Philadelphia, July, 1897.

- Catholic secondary education in the United States.
 Episcopate of Bishop Baraga.
 Catholic Spain—its politics and liberalism.
 Some reflections on Edmund Burke's centenary.
 Dr. F. H. Bradley's appearance and reality.
 St. Cyprian and the Holy See.
 New Oxford movement in England.
 Turkish struggle with Catholic Europe.
 Jacques André Emery.
 Old faith and the new woman.

Biblical World.

Chicago, August, 1897.

- Revelation—an exposition.
 Gospel and the Greek mysteries.
 Most urgent need in Old Testament study.

History of New Testament times.
 Primitive era of Christianity.

Christian Literature.

New York, August, 1897.

- Development of the doctrine of infant salvation.
 Lambeth conference and the historic episcopate.
 Longing of the soul for God.
 Secret of Christian experience.
 Study in stewardship.
 Pastoral experience.
 Personal piety in hot weather.
 Perils of spirituality.
 Notes from Dr. Hort's "The Christian Ecclesia."

The Expositor.

London, August, 1897.

- St. Mark in the New Testament.
 Professor Albert Réville's "Jésus de Nazareth."
 Relation of Christianity to pain.
 Last gleanings from the Sinai Palimpsest.

Tradition that there was a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives.
Good shepherd of Zech. xi.
Baptism of John: its place in New Testament history.
St. Paul's shipwreck.
Romans iii. 25, 26.

Expository Times.

Edinburgh, August, 1897.

Paul and Jesus.
Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah.
Hommel's "Ancient Hebrew Tradition."
Two fig trees.
Grace.
Stoicheiolatry.

The Homiletic Review.

New York, August, 1897.

How the non-church-going masses are to be reached.
Pulpit and liberty.
Personal factor in preaching.
Tübingen school of criticism.
Keeping of anniversaries.
The creation story—its origin.

Methodist Review.

New York, July-August, 1897.

Notes on an English ramble.
Should Methodists "sing low"?
Primary impression of preaching.
Function of doubt.
George Eliot—a sketch.
Religious thought in England between Puritan and Methodist.
The vendetta—how law evolves from the patriarchal cell.
Christ in the twentieth century.
Planting of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy.
Biography of spirit.

The Missionary Herald.

Boston, August, 1897.

Kusaie—Micronesia.
Two weeks' missionary trip in Japan.

Fourteenth annual meeting of the International Missionary Union.

Missionary Review.

New York, August, 1897.

Organizations of Christian young people.
Pigmies or dwarfs of Africa.
Miracle-working virgin of Andacolla.
Focus of heathenism in India.
Should Italy be evangelized?
Work among Italian navvies.
Evangelization of the French Canadians.
Christian Endeavor in India.
Protestant mission societies of Germany.
Scandinavian alliance mission of America.
Waldensian missions in Italy.
Evangelical church of Italy.

Preacher's Magazine.

New York, August, 1897.

Paul's secret.
Creed of the Mount.
Nobody—somebody—everybody.
Homely illustrations.

Protestant Episcopal Review.

Theological Seminary, Va., July, 1897.

Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life.
Cathedrals and the cathedral system in the light of church history.
Sponsorial obligation.
Foreign missions in the light of modern thought.

The Treasury.

New York, August, 1897.

Cooper Union, New York.
God's passover.

Future of faith.
 New theology the fulfilling of the old.
 Men's societies.
 Plenty of money for things we like.
 William Shakespeare.
 Higher criticism and the Sunday-school.

The Yale Review.

New Haven, August, 1897.

Prevention and relief of famine in India.
 Public expenditure in Europe.
 New administration in Canada.
 "Sociétés de Secours Mutuels."
 Recent economic and social legislation in the United States.

MAGAZINES.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for September contains: "Municipal Administration: The New York Police Force," Theodore Roosevelt; "Are the Rich Growing Richer and the Poor Poorer?" Carroll D. Wright; "A New Organization for the New Navy," Ira N. Hollis; "On Being Human," Woodrow Wilson; "A Southerner in the Peloponnesian War," Basil L. Gildersleeve; "Some Unpublished Letters of Dean Swift," George Birkbeck Hill; "The American Notion of Equality," Henry Childs Merwin; "Our Soldier," Harriet Lewis Bradley; "Benedicite," Martha Gilbert Dickinson; "Butterfield & Co.," Frances Courtenay Baylor; "A Carolina Mountain Pond," Bradford Torrey; "After the Storm: A Story of the Prairie," Elia W. Peattie; "Willow Dale," Lucy S. Conant; "A Second Marriage," Alice Brown; "In Quest of a Shadow: An Astronomical Experience in

Japan," Mabel Loomis Todd; "A Man and the Sea," Guy H. Scull.

THE contents of the CENTURY for September are: "Royalists and Republicans," Pierre de Coubertin; "Prisoners of State at Boro Boedor," Eliza Ruhamah Scidmore; "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," S. Weir Mitchell; "The Days of Jeanne d'Arc," Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "A Chopin Fantasy," Robert Underwood Johnson; "Cruelty in the Congo Free State," E. J. Glave; "Glimpses of Gladstone," Harry Furniss; "The Kinds that Cured," Walter Leon Sawyer; "A New Note in American Sculpture," Arthur Hoeber; "Campaigning with Grant," Horace Porter; "Browning's Summers in Brittany," A. M. Mosher; "An Adventure with a Dog and a Glacier," John Muir; "What Stopped the Ship," H. Phelps Whitmarsh; "Up the Matterhorn in a Boat," Marion Manville Pope.

SEPTEMBER HARPER'S contains: "Around London by Bicycle," Elizabeth Robins Pennell; "The Great Medicine-Horse, an Indian Myth of the Thunder," Frederic Remington; "The Milkweed," William Hamilton Gibson; "A Twentieth-Century Outlook," A. T. Mahan; "The Kentuckians," John Fox, Jr.; "The Beginnings of the American Navy," James Barnes; "Her Majesty," Marion Manville Pope; "The Great Stone of Sardis," Frank R. Stockton; "The Look in a Man's Face," M. Urquhart; "George du Maurier," Henry James; "The Lost Ball," W. G. Van Tassel Sutphen; "The Lotus Land of the Pacific," John Harrison Wagner; "Without Incumbrance," Emerson Gifford Taylor.

SEPTEMBER LIPPINCOTT'S contains: "Weeping Ferry," Margaret L. Woods; "The Trend of Horticulture," George Ethelbert Walsh; "At Bridge Twenty-Two," H. H. Bennett; "The Rocky Mountain Prophets," William Trowbridge Larned; "Europe and the Exposition of 1900," Theodore Stanton; "A Fiddle in the Desert," Charles M. Skinner; "The Chicago Drainage Channel," John L. Wright; "European House keeping," Frances Courtenay Baylor; "Emmy's Going Home," Frank Crane; "Musical Mexico," Arthur Howard Noll; "Books that Girls Have Loved," Erin Graham.

THE contents of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for September are: "San Sebastian, the Spanish Newport," William Henry Bishop; "The Workers," Walter A. Wyckoff; "The Way of an Election," Octave Thanet; "To the Shores of the Mingan Seigniory," Frederic Irland; "A Misunderstood Dog," Bradley Gilman; "Some Notes on Tennessee's Centennial," F. Hopkinson Smith; "Backgrounds," Frederic Crowninshield; "Lord Byron in the Greek Revolution," F. B. Sanborn; "At the Foot of the Rockies," Abbe Carter Goodloe; "The Durket Sperret," Sarah Barnwell Elliott.

LITERARY NOTES.

IN "A Rose of Yesterday" Mr. Crawford has given some of his best and strongest work. In these days, when so much is said about social degeneration, it is a very hopeful sign that a man of his experience, who cannot be considered in any degree narrow or provincial, should take the stand which he does in this novel on the

question of divorce. The story is absorbingly interesting, and its influence will be exceedingly strong.

IN the Educational Number of *The Outlook* Professor David P. Todd contributes an account of the Amherst Expedition to Japan to view the latest solar eclipse, and also explains in a really fascinating way, aided by pictures, the ingenious methods which science has lately adopted for this kind of astronomical work. This issue of *The Outlook* has seven richly illustrated articles, besides a charming short story, poems, other contributed articles, and the usual full news editorials and review departments.

A NUMBER of autograph letters written to Dean Farrar by Tennyson, Browning, Lowell, Holmes, Dean Stanley, and others will be reproduced in facsimile in Dean Farrar's forthcoming book, "Men I Have Known," to be published in October by Messrs. T. Y. Crowell & Co. They announce, also, a translation of the historical novel, "The Pharaoh," from the Polish of Boleslaw Prus.

THE Cleveland Public Library continues to issue its valuable "Cumulative Index" of periodicals. The July number contains 270 pages and over 34,000 references to seventy periodicals, from January to July inclusive.

THERE has long been need of a text-book on Roman history which is suited to the present requirements of the college entrance examinations. Admirably suited to the use of high schools and college preparatory schools is the "Short History of Rome," by E. S. Shuckburgh, whose larger work on "The History of Rome to the Battle of Actium" is already so well known.

CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

- June 16-23.—Eighth Annual Meeting of the *United Norwegian Lutheran Church*, at St. Paul, Minn.
- June 22.—Meeting of the *Board of Missions of the African Methodist Episcopal Church*, in New York City.
- June 30.—Meeting in the Interests of the *Women's National Sabbath Alliance*, at Northfield, Mass.
- July 7-14.—National Conference of *Charities and Correction*, in Toronto.
- July 9-20.—Middle Section Conference *Young Women's Christian Associations*, at Northfield, Mass.
- July 11-Aug. 28.—*Catholic Summer School*, at Cliff Haven, Lake Champlain, N. Y.
- July 13-23.—Pacific Section Conference of *Young Women's Christian Associations*, at Mill's College, Cal.
- July 15-18.—Third International Convention of the *Epworth League*, at Toronto, Canada.
- Seventh Annual Convention of the *Young People's Baptist Union*, in Chattanooga, Tenn.
- July 19-30.—*English Summer School for the Anglican Clergy*, at Cambridge, Eng.
- July 20.—Opening of the *Mormon Pioneer Jubilee*, at Salt Lake City.
- July 20-29.—Southern Assembly of the *International Christian Workers' Association*, at Mountain Retreat, N. C.
- July 21-23.—*Hampton Conference of Negro Workers*, at Hampton Institute.
- July 22.—Eleventh Annual *Lutheran Pen-Mar Reunion*, at Pen-Mar.
- July 25-Aug. 8.—First Summer Assembly of the *Jewish Chautauqua Society*, at Atlantic City, N. J.
- July 26-30.—Session of the *Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, at Ocean Grove, N. J.
- July 29-Aug. 16.—General Conference for *Christian Workers*, at Northfield, Mass.
- Aug. 2-7.—Fifth Annual Conference of the *Brotherhood of the Kingdom*, at Marlborough-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.
- Aug. 2-9.—Sixteenth Summer Meeting of the *Universalists*, at Weirs, N. H.
- Aug. 3.—Synod of the *British Province of the Moravian Church*, at Fulneck, Eng.
- Aug. 3-13.—Third Annual Session of the *Ocean Grove Summer School of Theology*, at Ocean Grove, N. J.
- Aug. 9.—Fourth Triennial Meeting of the *International Catholic Scientific Congress*, at Fribourg, Switzerland.
- Lady Henry Somerset* has resigned the presidency of the *British Woman's Temperance Association*.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

The Rev. James Trobec, of St. Paul, has been appointed *Bishop* of St. Cloud.

Titular of the Cathedral, is appointed *Archbishop* of Montreal.

Monsieur Louis-Joseph Paul-Napoleon Bruchesi, Canon

Cardinal Camillo Mazella has been made *Prefect* of the Congregation of Rites.

EPISCOPAL.

The Bishopric of Bristol has been reconstituted. The occupant of the See is not yet chosen.

The Rev. Robert A. Gibson has been elected *Bishop-Coadjutor* of Virginia.

The Rev. Dr. Herbert Mather, Provost of Inverness Cathedral, has been consecrated *Bishop* of Antigua.

The Rev. Dr. David H. Greer declines the call to the assistant bishopric of Rhode Island.

EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

The following elections to College Presidencies are recorded: *The Rev. Dr. McGill* to Monmouth College; *The Rev. Dr. Cadesman Pope* to the Methodist College at Arkadelphia, Ky.; *Professor T. M. Gatch* to the Agricultural College at Corvallis, Ore.; *Professor C. L. Wolcott* to St. Charles College; *The Rev. George James Jones, Ph.D.*, to Gale College, Wis.; *R. Lin Cave* to Kentucky University.

Dr. T. A. Stewart, of Christ Church, Oxford, takes the

chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

The following resignations are recorded: *President E. Benjamin Andrews*, of Brown University; *Vice-President John L. McKee*, of Centre College; *President S. F. Scovel, D.D.*, of Wooster; *President W. H. Wilder*, of Illinois Wesleyan University; *President Charles Manly, D.D.*, of Furman University, Greenville, S. C.; and *President J. W. Parkhill*, of Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Professor Henry Churchill King, of Oberlin College, has been elected to the chair of Systematic Theology in Oberlin Theological Seminary.

The Rev. Walter Rauschenbush, of the Second German

Baptist Church, New York City, accepts the call to the chair of New Testament Interpretation in Rochester Theological Seminary.

The Rev. D. J. Thomas, M.A., Vice-Principal of the Winches-

ter Diocesan Training College, has been elected Principal of the *Anglican Home and Colonial Training College*, Gray's Inn Road, London.

The Rev. R. L. Ottley has resigned the headship of the

Pusey House, in which post he succeeded *Canon Gore*.

The Rev. F. Wilfrid Osborne has resigned the post of Vice-Principal of the *Episcopal Theological College*, Edinburgh.

OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. James (Anglican), in St. David's, Wales, June 25, aged 95. He was graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, 1825; was ordained deacon, 1834, and priest, 1835, in Misterton, Gloucestershire; became vicar of Castlemartin, Pembrokeshire, 1839; became a curial prebendary of St. David's, 1847; was appointed a residentiary canon, 1870, becoming chancellor; resigned his vicarship, 1872; succeeded to the deanery, 1878, resigning in 1895, but remaining attached to the cathedral as third curial prebendary.

Barten, Rev. Otto Sievers (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.* (University of William and Mary, 1869), in Norfolk, Va., June 26, aged 66. He was born in Hamburg, Germany; removed to this country, 1850; graduated from the General Theological Seminary, New York, 1856; was admitted to the diaconate, entering on his duties at Copake Iron Works, N. Y., 1856; entered the priesthood and took charge of St. John's Church, Northampton, Mass., 1857; removed on account of poor health to Virginia, where he became rector of St. James' Church, Warrenton, 1859; took charge of Christ Church, Norfolk, 1865, where he was rector at the time of his death, having served it for thirty-two years.

Brown, Rev. David (Free Church of Scotland), *D.D.*, *LL.D.* (Aberdeen University, 1872 and 1895), in Aberdeen, July 3, aged 94. Dr. Brown was a native of Aberdeen; was graduated from Marischal College, 1821; studied divinity at Aberdeen and Edinburgh; was licensed to preach, 1826; assisted Edward Irving at Regent Square Chapel, London, for a year and a half; subsequently was assistant at Dumbarton; was ordained minister at Ord, in Banffshire, 1835; was prominent in the Disruption of 1843, and was inducted minister of Free St. James' Church, Glasgow, the same year; was appointed Professor of Apologetics, Exegesis of the Gospels, and Senior Church History in the Free Church College at Aberdeen, 1857; became principal of the college, 1876; he retired from the teaching duties, 1887, but retained the executive till his death; he was made moderator of the Free Assembly in 1885. Dr. Brown was the author of numerous works, including a "Portable Commentary on the New Testament," commentaries on Romans, Corinthians, and the Gospels. He received from the King of Servia the decoration of Knight Commander of the Royal Order of St. Sava for abridging his commentaries for translation into Servian.

Butler, Very Rev. T. J. (Roman Catholic), *D.D.*, in Rome. July 16, aged 64. Father Butler was born in Limerick, Ireland; was educated by his uncle, the bishop of Limerick; was sent to the Irish College at Rome, 1848, where he became a favorite of Pius IX.; after being advanced to the priesthood, he still remained in Rome to take his doctorate; later he came with three brothers to the United States, taking up work in Chicago; when the war broke out, Dr. Butler went to the front as chaplain, where he was taken prisoner, sent to Andersonville, tried and sentenced as a spy, but reprieved; after the war, he returned to Chicago, but with health undermined; having built up a prosperous parish, he was transferred to Rockford, Ill.; subsequently he was made rector of St. John's Church, Chicago; just before his death he had been appointed bishop of Concordia, Kan., and was to have been consecrated on the second day after that on which he died.

Camp, Rev. Stephen H. (Unitarian), *D.D.*, in Woodstock, Conn., July 30, aged 60. Dr. Camp was born in Windsor, Conn.; was graduated from Meadville Theological Seminary; during the war served as chaplain of a colored regiment; after the war he became pastor at Toledo, O.; was called to the Third Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, 1869, and was pastor there till his death. Dr. Camp was noted for his interest in charitable and philanthropic work.

Craig, Rev. William P. (Presbyterian), in Chicago, July 14, aged 35. He was the son of

Professor Willis Green Craig, of McCormick Theological Seminary, and was born at Keokuk, Ia.; he was graduated from Parsons College, 1882, and McCormick Seminary, 1885; he was immediately called to Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; resigned, 1888, and went to Princeton Theological Seminary for a year's special study; was called to Caro, Mich., 1889; his health began to fail, and he accepted a call to Pomona, Cal., 1892, and remained there four years and a half; the last year of his life was a losing struggle for life, and he died at his father's residence.

Dana, Rev. Malcolm McGregor (Congregationalist), *D.D.*, in Brooklyn, N. Y., July 25, aged 60. He was born in Brooklyn; was graduated from Amherst College, 1859, and from Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1863; began his ministerial life the same year in Winston, Conn.; became pastor of the Second Congregational Church of Norwich, Conn., 1864; formed the Park Congregational Church in Norwich, 1874; was called to the Plymouth Congregational Church, St. Paul, Minn., 1878; while in this pastorate six colonies were established from his church; took charge of the Kirk Street Congregational Church, Lowell, Mass., 1888; resigned and retired from active life, 1894. Dr. Dana was twice chosen chaplain of the lower house of the Minnesota Legislature, and in 1887, as vice-president of the Minnesota Board of Corrections and Charities, was sent to England to inspect the British Prison System. He was for seven years chairman of the Congregational Missionary Board of Minnesota, and was a founder

and president of the Congregational Board of the State.

Fulton, Rev. Robert H. (Presbyterian), *D.D.* (Washington and Jefferson College), in Philadelphia, July 12, aged 54. He was born in Washington County, Pa.; was graduated from Washington and Jefferson College, 1866; engaged in teaching for four years, studying theology privately; was graduated from the Western Theological Seminary, 1872, and was ordained the same year to the charge of the Second Presbyterian Church, Baltimore; accepted a call to the Northminster Church, Philadelphia, 1883, and remained there as pastor till his death.

Gallagher, Rev. Mason (Reformed Episcopal), in Brooklyn, N. Y., July 5, aged 76. Mr. Gallagher gained his education at the Flushing Institute, Geneva College, and the General Theological Seminary, New York; he entered the Protestant Episcopal ministry at Cazenovia, N. Y.; was called thence to Dansville, N. Y., and subsequently to Oswego; served during the war as chaplain, and was secretary of the Society of Chaplains of the Army of the Potomac; was appointed assistant rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, 1866; later was rector at Covington, Ky., Duluth, Minn., and Paterson, N. J.; assisted in the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873, since which he has been influential in its councils; he was the author of several books, including "The True Churchman Vindicated" and "The True Historic Episcopate."

Goold, Rev. William Henry (Free Church of Scotland),

D.D. (University of Edinburgh), in Edinburgh, June 30, aged 82. Dr. Goold was born in Edinburgh, his father being pastor of the Cameronian Church there; he was educated at Edinburgh University and the Theological Hall of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; he was licensed, 1838; was ordained and installed his father's assistant, 1840, eventually succeeding to the sole charge; was elected Professor of Church History, 1854; was active in the union of the Free Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the next year was moderator of the General Assembly; at his death he was senior minister of the Martyrs' Free Church; he had been long a secretary of the National Bible Society of Scotland, and was interested in the New Zealand Mission of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. He was a delegate to the Pan-Presbyterian Council in Philadelphia.

Hewit, Very Rev. Augustine F. [Nathaniel Augustus] (Roman Catholic), *D.D.* (Amherst College, 1866), in New York City, July 3, aged 77. He was born at Fairfield, Conn., of Presbyterian parentage; he was graduated from Amherst College, 1839; studied for two years in the East Windsor Theological Institute, Conn., and received his license as a Congregational minister, 1841; he soon turned to the Protestant Episcopal Church, went to Baltimore to pursue his studies, and was soon ordained a deacon in that church; he renounced Protestantism in 1845, and was ordained a priest in the Roman Church, 1847; he spent three years in mission work near Charleston, S. C.; his next step was to join the

Redemptionist Fathers in New York, 1850, and was assistant priest at the Church of the Holy Redeemer; began a missionary tour, which lasted seven years, 1851; with Father Hecker, he founded the order of the Paulists, 1858, and when the former died, he was made Superior of the order; he gave up mission work, 1865, and devoted himself to study and literature; during these last years he was a frequent contributor to the *Catholic World* and *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, besides publishing and editing numerous works.

Hulbert, Rev. Palmer S. (Congregationalist), *D.D.*, in Oak Park, Ill., July 23, aged 47. He was born in Lockaber, N. S.; became a teacher at seventeen; came to the United States in 1870; was graduated from Wabash College, 1876, and from Auburn Theological Seminary, 1879; he was pastor successively of the Presbyterian churches at Fremont, Neb., and Waverly, N. Y.; of the Congregationalist churches in Newburyport, Mass., and Providence, R. I.; he next was assistant pastor with Dr. Burrell in the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York; became pastor of the First Congregational Church, Oak Park, near Chicago, 1895, but resigned this charge July 1, 1897.

Langford, Rev. William Spaight (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, at Haines Falls, N. Y., July 2, aged 56. He was born in Fall River, Mass.; entered business life when fifteen, occupying several most responsible positions; declined the offer of a partnership in a banking business that he might study for the ministry; spent

four years in study at Gambier, O.; was ordained in 1867, and became assistant at St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn; was called to Englewood, N. J., 1868; next became rector of St. John's, Yonkers, whence he was invited to St. John's, Elizabeth, N. J., 1875; accepted the position of general secretary of the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions, 1885, realizing that his business training fitted him peculiarly for that office, which he held till his death.

Mulcahey, Rev. James (Protestant Episcopal), *S.T.D.* (Columbia College, 1866), at Saratoga Springs, July 12, aged 75. He was born at Warren, R. I.; was graduated from Washington College, Hartford, 1842, and from the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va., 1845; was ordained deacon, 1845, and priest, 1846; spent his diocese in mission work in Rhode Island; was rector successively of St. Mary's, South Portsmouth; Trinity Church, Pawtucket, R. I.; St. Stephen's, Middlebury, Vt.; Christ Church, Troy, N. Y.; the Church of the Messiah, Providence, R. I.; Grace Church, New Bedford, Mass., and Trinity Church, Toledo, O.; was elected assistant minister of Trinity Church, New York, and assigned to St. Paul's Chapel, 1874; resigned and retired as vicar emeritus, 1894; celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his priesthood, 1896; was twice elected delegate to the General Convention. He was a member of the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions, and a trustee of the General Theological Seminary. He has published several volumes, the last being "The Inspiration of History."

- Stokes, Rev. Elwood H.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, at Ocean Grove, N. J., July 16, aged 82. Dr. Stokes was born in Medford, N. J.; was received on probation as a preacher, 1844; occupied various charges in his conference; on the organization of the Ocean Grove Camp-Meeting Association, 1869, he was made its president, and had been the guiding spirit from that time till his death. Besides his duties in this connection he had others, and at his decease he was presiding elder of the New Brunswick district of the New Jersey Conference.
- Bills, Rev. James E.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Rochester, N. Y., July 16, aged 65.
- Bly, Rev. William T.* (Baptist), at Etna, Minn., June 16, aged 75.
- Corkhill, Rev. Thomas E.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Mt. Pleasant, Ia., June 30.
- Davis, Rev. Abraham* (Methodist Episcopal), in White Plains, July 18, aged 78.
- Davis, Rev. Edwin R.* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, at Perth Amboy, N. J.
- Davis, Rev. Lewis P.* (Methodist Episcopal, Presiding Elder), *D.D.*, at Bay View, Mich., July 12, aged 58.
- Dugmore, Rev. Henry Hare* (Wesleyan Methodist Missionary), in Cape Town, Africa, aged 88.
- Ellis, Rev. Frank M.* (Baptist), *D.D.*, in Brooklyn, N. Y., June 28, aged 59.
- Evans, Rev. Frederick* (Baptist), *D.D.*, in Wales, July 22, aged 50.
- Gersoni, Rev. Henry* (Hebrew), *Ph.D.*, in New York City, June 28, aged 54.
- Harman, Rev. Henry M.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, *L.L.D.*, in Baltimore, July 2, aged 75.
- Havermans, Rev. Peter* (Roman Catholic), in Troy, July 22, aged 91. Father Havermans was the oldest priest in the United States.
- Hopkins, Rev. Judson H.* (Presbyterian), in Rye, N. Y., July 11, aged 67.
- Howe, Rev. Franklin S.* (Presbyterian), at Burdett, N. Y., July 13, aged 88.
- Ironsides, Rev. S.* (Australian Wesleyan Methodist), in Hobart Town, Tasmania, aged 83.
- McCool, Rev. J. B.* (Presbyterian), *M.D.*, in Philadelphia, Pa., July 3.
- Measham, Rev. Richard* (Anglican), in Bellingham, North Lyne, Eng. July 2.
- Morris, Rev. William H.* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Boston, Mass., June 27, aged 50.
- Parks, Rev. Hugh Whiteford* (Presbyterian), at Hopedale, O., July 29, aged 60.
- Richardson, Rev. E. M.* (Southern Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Memphis, Tenn., June 30, aged 69. Dr. Richardson was secretary of the Board of Education.
- Rockwell, Rev. George* (Dutch Reformed), in Tarrytown, N. Y., aged 76.
- Slater, Rev. Francis* (Anglican Canon of Ely), in Cambridge, July 2, aged 60.
- Wingfield, Rev. Charles Lee* (Anglican Canon of St. Alban's), *M.A.*, in Oxford, July 2, aged 64.

CALENDAR.

[The compiler will welcome notices of meetings of general importance and interest, provided such notices reach him before the 10th of the month prior to that in which the meetings are to take place. Exact dates and names of places, when and where the meetings are to be held, are desired.]

- Aug. 30-Sept. 3.—*International Anti-Alcoholic Congress*, in Brussels, Belgium.
- Aug. 31-Sept. 4.—Session of the *American Social Science Association*, in Saratoga, N. Y.
- Sept. 5-12.—Eleventh Session of *The Congress of Orientalists*, in Paris, France.
- Sept. 20-23.—Seventeenth Biennial Meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, at Saratoga, N. Y.
- Sept. 23.—Synod of the *German Province of the Moravians*.
- Fortieth Anniversary of the *Fulton Street*, N. Y., *Daily Noon Prayer Meeting*.
- Sept. 27.—Fifty-first Annual Conference of the *Evangelical Alliance*, at Cambridge, Eng.
- Sept. 21-Oct. 1.—*Ecclesiastical and Educational Art Exhibition*, in Nottingham, Eng.
- Sept. 28-Oct. 1.—*Anglican Church Congress*, in Nottingham, Eng.
- Oct. 11-16.—Autumn Meetings of the *British Congregational Union*, in Birmingham.
- Oct. 12-15.—Eighty-eighth Annual Meeting of the *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, in New Haven, Conn.
- Oct. 13-17.—First International Convention of the *Brotherhood of St. Andrew*, in Buffalo, N. Y.
- Oct. 16-20.—Session of the *National Prison Association*, in Austin, Tex.
- Oct. 19.—Meeting of the *Protestant Episcopal Missionary Council*, at Milwaukee.
- Oct. 19-21.—Meeting of the *American Missionary Association*, in Minneapolis.
- Oct. 20-25.—Fifth Conference of *Friends* (Orthodox), in Indianapolis.
- Oct. 23-26.—World's Convention of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Unions*, in Toronto.
- Oct. 26-27.—Annual Convention of the *Open and Institutional Church League*, in Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Oct. 26-Nov. 1.—Fifth Annual Convention of the *Woman's Parsonage and Home Missionary Society* of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Knoxville, Tenn.
- Oct. 27.—Meeting of the *Congregational Woman's Home Missionary Association*, in Boston.
- Oct. 29-Nov. 3.—Convention of the *National Woman's Christian Temperance Union*, in Buffalo, N. Y.

Christian Literature

*A Monthly Review of
Religious Thought and Movement*

30 Cents a Number \$3.00 a Year

*Advertising Rates on Application
Address all Communications to*

The Christian Literature Co.
NEW YORK

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

Creameries in South Dakota.

DURING the past two years the creamery industry has grown from a small beginning until at the present time there are one hundred and nineteen (119) creameries and cheese factories scattered over the State, and all doing well.

Four times as many creameries are needed in South Dakota, and farmers or dairymen desiring free list showing where creameries are now located, together with other information of value to livestock growers and farmers generally, will please address George H. Heafford, General Passenger Agent, C., M. & St. P. R'y, 410 Old Colony Building, Chicago, Ill.

The St. Denis.

NEW YORK has a reputation for having more thoroughly first-class hotels than any other city in America, and, in fact, this reputation is not confined to this continent only, but is almost world-wide. Among them, one which is justly famous is the St.

Denis, whose career on the corner of Broadway and Eleventh Street has been so uniformly successful. Although situated in what is now the retail shopping district, it is so carefully managed and so well appointed that it is an ideal place to stop at while in New York. It has a particular charm for Church people, in that it is conveniently situated near so many Church activities. Grace Church is just opposite, the Church of the Ascension scarcely two blocks away, St. George's Church and the See House two or three minutes' walk away.

The famous "Taylor Restaurant," which is a part of the hotel, has always been noted for the excellence of its table, and yet its charges, considering the high quality of service, are very moderate.

The Stearns Bicycle.

A NEATLY dressed cyclist on a second-grade bicycle is a trial on the nerves. It is directly contrary to "the eternal fitness" of things.

The Stearns bicycle is a mount for any one to feel proud of, and it reflects toward its rider a certain air of high breeding.

Young men and riders who desire a particularly light wheel, and one with a distinctive touch of grace and beauty, should examine the Stearns Special.

THE League of American Wheelmen have now ready their long-expected book of road maps, called "Fifty Miles Around New York," which really covers more ground than the title calls for. The volume is compact and suitable for the pocket.